



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

The Love of Neighbour (Lev 19:18)

The Early Reception History of Its Priestly Formula

Kengo Akiyama

Doctor of Philosophy
The University of Edinburgh
2015

Abstract

This thesis examines the early Jewish reception of the love command (Lev 19:18) during the Second Temple period. Although the ascendancy of this command as the “greatest” command in later Jewish and Christian writings is well-known, the historical interpretative process through which this levitical love command came to be viewed as such is not widely known. The thesis begins by examining the meaning of Lev 19:18 in its original context and then systematically traces its interpretation in Second Temple, Jewish literature by carefully examining its citations in context. The study examines the Greek translation of Lev 19:18 in the Septuagint, followed by a series of sustained exegetical analyses of interpretations of Lev 19:18 in the Book of Jubilees, the Damascus Document, the Community Rule, Galatians, Romans, James, and the Synoptic Gospels. Although the citations of Lev 19:18 are infrequent in the Second Temple period, a careful consideration of each occurrence demonstrates diverse, if complex, developments vis-à-vis Lev 19:18. It is argued that no mainstream Jewish interpretation of Lev 19:18 existed during the Second Temple period, and the analysis repudiates a simplistic, evolutionary trajectory (e.g., from restricted, intra-communal obligation to universal altruism) regarding its interpretative development. The study concludes by identifying important areas of development that paved the way for Lev 19:18 to become the indispensable, hermeneutical key and summary command in Jewish and Christian thought.

Declaration

I, Kengo Akiyama, hereby declare that this thesis has been composed by me and that it has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	7
Abbreviations	8
Chapter One - Introduction	
1.1 In search of an ancient reception history	9
1.2 Research context	13
1.3 Aim and scope	21
1.4 Lev 19:18 in Second Temple Jewish literature	24
1.5 Course of analysis	26
Chapter Two - The Love Command in Leviticus	
2.1 Introduction	29
2.2 A brief overview of scholarship on Leviticus.....	29
2.3 The love of neighbour in context	34
2.3.1 Some preliminary remarks	35
2.3.2 Neighbour <i>par excellence</i> (19:11-18)	39
2.3.2.1 אהב	51
2.3.2.2 רע	56
2.3.3 The extended neighbourly love (19:33-34)	60
2.3.3.1 גר	62
2.3.3.2 כמוד	75
2.4 Conclusion	88
Chapter Three - Lev 19:18 in the Septuagint and the Book of Jubilees	
3.1 Introduction	93
3.2 Lev 19:18 in the Septuagint	93
3.2.1 Interpretative disambiguation?.....	100
3.2.2 Interim summary: the ambiguity of כמוד and ὡς σεαυτόν	106
3.3 Lev 19:18 in the Book of Jubilees	108
3.3.1 Jubilees' literary technique	111
3.3.2 Love as "what is right/just" and "peaceful coexistence"	112
3.3.3 Love as covenant fulfilment	121
3.3.4 The importance of rebuke	122
3.4 Conclusion	125
Chapter Four - Lev 19:18 in the Dead Sea Scrolls	
4.1 Introduction	129
4.1.1 The relationship between CD and S	130
4.2 Lev 19:18 in the Damascus Document.....	133

4.2.1	CD (MS-A) 6:11b-7:6a	135
4.2.1.1	The heading (CD 6:11b-14)	138
4.2.1.2	The first set of injunctions (CD 6:14-20)	141
4.2.1.3	The second set of injunctions (CD 6:20-7:4)	144
4.2.2	The brother גר in CD	158
4.2.3	Interim summary	160
4.3	Lev 19:18 in the Community Rule?	162
4.3.1	Love and hate in S	164
4.3.2	Rebuke as a legal requirement	167
4.3.3	No גר in S?	171
4.3.4	Interim summary	172
4.4	Conclusion	175
Chapter Five - Lev 19:18 in the New Testament		
5.1	Introduction	177
5.2	The Pauline love of neighbour	182
5.2.1	Gal 5:13-14	183
5.2.2	Rom 13:8-10	193
5.2.3	Interim summary: love as “fulfilment of the Law”	202
5.3	The Jamesian love of neighbour	204
5.3.1	Leviticus 19 in James	205
5.3.2	Jas 2:1-13 in context	207
5.3.3	Interim summary: love as the “royal” law	220
5.4	The love of neighbour in the Synoptic Gospels	222
5.4.1	The Markan love of neighbour	225
5.4.1.1	Love as the command <i>par excellence</i> (Mark 12:28-34)...	226
5.4.2	The Matthean love of neighbour	234
5.4.2.1	Matt 5:43-48	234
5.4.2.2	Matt 19:16-22	237
5.4.2.3	Love as the hermeneutical crux (22:34-40)	242
5.4.3	The Lukan love of neighbour	249
5.4.3.1	Part I: Love as the key to eternal life (10:25-28)	250
5.4.3.2	Part II: Love as supreme compassion (10:29-37)	255
5.5	Conclusion	267
Chapter Six - Conclusion		
6.1	Revisiting the question	273
6.2	Summary of the chapters	274
6.3	Tying the knots: the ancient reception of Lev 19:18	280
Bibliography		284

Acknowledgements

In writing this thesis, I have accrued many debts. My sincere thanks first go to my supervisor, Prof Timothy H. Lim, who took an active interest in this project and patiently guided me through these past few years. He has greatly encouraged me at times and strongly challenged me at other times but always stimulating my thoughts in the process. I have felt not only well looked after as his student but also befriended beyond the bounds of the supervisor-student framework. I would also like to thank several others at New College who have generously given me their time to read and comment on various parts of this thesis: Prof Larry Hurtado, Dr David Reimer, Dr Matt Novenson, Dr Kurtis J Peters, Mr Stephen Stiles, and Mr Will Kelly.

I would like to acknowledge the help of and express my gratitude to various funding bodies, namely, College of Humanities and Social Science (The University of Edinburgh), School of Divinity (New College), Fondation Catholique Ecosaise, and the Erasmus Programme. Their generous financial provision has made it possible for me to pursue this doctoral research.

I am grateful for Prof Dr Michael Tilly and Dr Beth Langstaff of Tübingen who took me under their wings during my one-year exchange. Special thanks to Mr Hamish Alexander who read most of the thesis and made numerous helpful suggestions—I know the task was arduous! Furthermore, I am indebted to my examiners Prof John Barton and Prof John F A Sawyer for all their kind help, not least for their insightful feedback. They made my viva a delightful experience, and I appreciate the time they put into reading the thesis and engaging with me.

いつもありがとう to my family, especially to Dad, Mom, and Aunt Yukiko whose continuing encouragement and support mean so much to me. Finally, my deep gratitude and love to my dearest wife, Aya, without whom and whose support this thesis probably would not have come to fruition and the journey definitely not so enjoyable. 言葉ではどうしても言い切れないけど、心の底からありがとう。I dedicate this study to Aya and to our baby, Isla, who has been our daily source of insuppressible joy and a concrete reminder that love is meant not only to be studied but also to be learned in practice each day.

Abbreviations

All abbreviations are taken from *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines* (2nd edition). Below are abbreviations not found in the Handbook.

AYB	The Anchor Yale Bible
(C)IOSCS	(Congress of) the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
CUP	Cambridge University Press
DCH	Clines, David, ed. <i>The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . 8 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-2011.
JSJSup	<i>Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
LXX-Lev	The Septuagint of Leviticus
OBC	Barton, John, and John Muddiman, eds. <i>The Oxford Bible Commentary</i> . Oxford: OUP, 2007.
OHDSS	Lim, Timothy H., and John J. Collins, eds. <i>The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> . Oxford: OUP, 2010.
OUP	Oxford University Press
ThWQ	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten</i>
V&R	Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht
WdG	Walter de Gruyter
(W)JKP	(Westminster) John Knox Press
WTJ	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
YUP	Yale University Press

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 In search of an ancient reception history

Principles may seem timeless, but every important idea has a history. Normative and widespread principles of today were not necessarily the golden rules of yesterday. In fact, the development of key principles sometimes takes a surprisingly long time. For instance, while the wheel-and-axle principle, which was a revolutionary technological feat, may seem so simple, logical and straightforward to those who are familiar with its structure and everyday function, the invention of a wheel took quite a long time.¹ Or, one could think of the dictum of universal human equality. The very concept that undergirds the modern person's commitment to treating every human as one another's equal, which in turn begets the very possibility of democracy, is now such a well-established and normative concept in Western Society (at least in theory). While it may be hard to imagine why anyone would fail to affirm the principle now, its establishment went through a long process and came into view relatively recently.

The famous maxim "love your neighbour as yourself" is another key principle with a history. While the command to love one's neighbour is often

1. Anthony estimates the invention of wheels to be no earlier than 4000 BCE, though wheeled vehicles only become widespread after 3400 BCE. David W. Anthony, *The Horse, the Wheel, and Language* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 59-75.

attributed to Jesus Christ, he was not the first to utter these words. The Jesus of the Gospels who was deeply rooted in the world of the Torah and its teachings took this quotation from Lev 19:18. Of all the places in the HB where one might suspect this familiar command would be found, Leviticus is perhaps the least expected. The levitical love command eventually comes to attain the status of the “greatest” command (coupled with Deut 6:5) or the “royal” law (Jas 2:8), the Golden Rule (R. Hillel) and so forth by the Common Era. The Christian tradition subsequently hailed the love of neighbour as the paragon of universal, ethical principles. For example, Augustine taught that the love of neighbour is to be extended towards every human being on account of God:

So now, as there are four kinds of things to be loved: one which is above us, the second which we are ourselves, the third which is on a level with us, the fourth which is beneath us, about the second and the fourth there was no need to give any commandments.... When indeed love of God is put first, and the manner of that love is clearly prescribed, indicating that everything else is to converge on it ... to love things, that is to say, in the right order, so that you do not love what is not to be loved, or fail to love what is to be loved, or have a greater love for what should be loved less, or an equal love for things that should be loved less or more, or a lesser or greater love for things that should be loved equally. No sinner, precisely as sinner, is to be loved; and every human being, precisely as human, is to be loved on God's account, God though on his own. And if God is to be loved more than any human being, we all ought to love God more than ourselves. ... So what all that has been said amounts to, while we have been dealing with things, is that the fulfillment and the end of the law and of all the divine scriptures is love (Rom 13:8; 1 Tm 1:5); love of the thing which is to be enjoyed, and of the thing which is able to enjoy that thing together with us....²

2. Augustine, *Teaching Christianity*, trans. John E. Rotelle and Edmund Hill (New York: New City Press, 1996), 116-24 [I.xxiii-xxxv].

In his lectures on Romans, Luther writes:

[I]t can be understood that we are commanded to love only our neighbor, using our love for ourselves as an example. ...this is a most profound commandment, and each person must test himself according to it by means of careful examination. For through this expression, 'as yourself', every pretense of love is excluded.³

Calvin states in his commentary on Galatians:

[Since God is invisible,] God chooses to make trial of our love to himself by that love of our brother, which he enjoins us to cultivate.... The word, neighbour, includes all men living; for we are linked together by a common nature.... The image of God ought to be particularly regarded as a sacred bond of union; but, for that very reason, no distinction is here made between friend and foe, nor can the wickedness of men set aside the right of nature. ... The love which men naturally cherish toward themselves ought to regulate our love of our neighbour.⁴

While the reception of Lev 19:18 in the Common Era is well-known, its interpretative development before the Common Era is scarcely known. The prevalence of this command among later Christian and Jewish writings leaves one with the impression that Lev 19:18 must have undergone an interpretative process during the Second Temple period that gave rise to the grand interpretative tradition of summarising God's will for humankind and reading the entire Scripture with this phrase as a—or rather *the*—hermeneutical key.⁵ However, the explicit discussion of the levitical love

3. Martin Luther, *Lectures on Romans*, vol. 25 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Hilton C. Oswald (St. Louis: Concordia, 1972), 475.

4. John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians*, trans. William Pringle (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1854), 160.

5. For a history of Jewish interpretation of Lev 19:18 in antiquity and Middle Ages, see;

command rarely occurs in ancient Jewish sources prior to the first century CE. In fact, neither Lev 19:18b nor 19:34 is ever quoted verbatim in the rest of the HB. A love command similar to Lev 19:34 is found in Deut 10:19 (which most scholars take to predate Lev 19:18) and Deut 6:5 adds a command to love YHWH, but otherwise the command to love one's neighbour is absent. Even in the NT, despite the hefty weight placed on the levitical command as the greatest or summary or royal law that fulfils the Law, its citations and discussions are sparse. Furthermore, if one broadened the horizon and looked for other Jewish sources from the Second Temple period, one is once again struck by the paucity of citations and treatments of this verse. Given the theological significance placed on Lev 19:18 by later interpreters, this phenomenon is rather curious. It appears as if the levitical love command was mentioned as *an* important principle that governs a small section of Lev 19:11-18 and ceased to be remembered for several centuries, only to emerge suddenly as *the* greatest commandment in the first century CE.

Why such a historical gap? How was Lev 19:18 read during the Second Temple period? Since every reception of a command necessarily carries, however minor, a degree of interpretative change or innovation, such a phenomenon should be expected vis-à-vis Lev 19:18 as well. Jesus did not simply read Lev 19:18 "as it was" and formulate one of the most enduring traditions, namely, the Double Love Command tradition. Before the emergence of the Double Love Command tradition, there must have been an interpretative tradition that prepared the way for his historic pronouncement.

Reinhard Neudecker, "'And You Shall Love Your Neighbor as Yourself—I Am the Lord' (Lev 19:18) in Jewish Interpretation," *Biblica* 73 (1992): 496–517.

1.2 Research context

There is a long history of commentary on Lev 19:18 and its NT reflexes in critical scholarship. As this thesis will need to traverse a number of disciplines within Biblical Studies, pertinent overviews of scholarly literature will be noted in each chapter. However, a brief and broad overview of research vis-à-vis Lev 19:18 here will help frame our discussion.

It has become a standard procedure to take the Double Love Commandment tradition as the point of departure and move in one of two general directions. On the one hand, many studies attempt to articulate the meaning of the Double Love Command as it was understood by the historical Jesus or the Gospel writers.⁶ These studies search for potential parallels in early Jewish and Hellenistic sources that might bring to light the socio-theological backdrop of the formation of the Double Love Command. They look for evidence of discussion on the love of God and the love of neighbour in order to identify the source of influence or to situate Jesus in or against some stream of Jewish tradition.⁷ In so doing, these studies examine Lev 19:18 in its original context and some limited aspect of its subsequent

6. For instance: Günther Bornkamm, "Das Doppelgebot der Liebe," in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann: Zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 20. August 1954*, ed. Walther Eltester, BZNW 21 (Berlin: WdG, 1957), 85–93; Klaus Berger, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu: Teil I - Markus und Parallelen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972).

7. Ruzer reverses this trend and tries to situate the NT texts in the wider Jewish exegetical practices or patterns. He treats Lev 19:18 and the Double Love Command in detail as a test case. Serge Ruzer, "From 'Love Your Neighbor' to 'Love Your Enemy': Trajectories in Early Jewish Exegesis," *RB* 109 (2002): 371–89; idem, "The Double Love Precept in the New Testament and the *Community Rule*," in *Jesus' Last Week*, ed. R. Steven Notley, Marc Turnage, and Brian Becker, *Jerusalem Studies in the Synoptic Gospels 1; Jewish and Christian Perspectives 11* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 81–106. The revised versions of these articles are found in chapters two and three of: idem, *Mapping the New Testament: Early Christian Writings as a Witness for Jewish Biblical Exegesis*, *Jewish and Christian Perspectives 13* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

reception, although the main concern is how Lev 19:18 becomes associated with Deut 6:5 during the Second Temple period. On the other hand, several studies focus on the reception of the Double Love Command by the followers of Jesus in the first century CE and thereafter. For instance, the works of Moffatt, Spicq, Montefiore, Furnish, and Lütgert differentiate the conceptions of neighbourly love and their connexion to the love of God among NT writers and search for various theological and socio-political factors that shaped their diverse reception.⁸ Yet once again, these studies seek to examine primarily the development surrounding the love of God and the love of neighbour or more generally the love ethic in the NT.

Leviticus 19:18 also occupies an important place in the discussion of biblical law. Some scholars have sought to investigate the integral relationship between law and narrative in the Pentateuch. For example, Jackson conducts a careful, narratological study of biblical law and analyses the literary manifestation of “multiculturalism,” that is, “Israelite identity as against that of ‘the Other’.”⁹ The literary presentation of the neighbour and

8. James Moffatt, *Love in the New Testament* (New York: Richard R. Smith, 1930); Viktor Warnach, *Agape: Die Liebe als Grundmotiv der neutestamentlichen Theologie* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1951); Ceslas Spicq, *Agapè dans le nouveau testament: analyse des textes, Etudes bibliques* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1958); the English translation of Spicq’s work with abbreviated footnotes: idem, *Agape in the New Testament*, trans. Marie Aquinas McNamara and Mary Honoria Richter, 3 vols. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book, 1965); Hugh Montefiore, “Thou Shalt Love The Neighbour as Thyself,” *NT* 5 (1962): 157–70; Victor Paul Furnish, *The Love Command in the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972); Wilhelm Lütgert, *Die Liebe im Neuen Testament: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Urchristentums* (Giessen/Basel: Brunnen, 1986). John Meier’s magnum opus deals with the levitical love command as well, although Meier’s primary interest is merely in identifying whether or not the tradition goes back to the historical Jesus. John P. Meier, *Law and Love*, vol. 4 of *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, AYBRL (New Haven: YUP, 2009), 478–646.

9. Bernard S. Jackson, “The Literary Presentation of Multiculturalism in Early Biblical Law,” *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law* 8 (1995): 181; idem, *Studies in the Semiotics of Biblical Law*, JSOTSup 314 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); idem, *Wisdom-Laws: A Study of the Mishpatim of Exodus 21:1–22:16* (Oxford: OUP, 2006).

the non-neighbour occupies a significant place in his study. Carmichael thinks Pentateuchal laws are derived not from historical events but from biblical narrative itself, and they stand as evidence of ancient scribal-literary activity.¹⁰ Even more common is the discussion of Lev 19:18 in OT ethics and its reflexes in the modern ethical discourse. For instance, in the Ethel Wood Lecture, Clements seeks to “uncover the fundamental assumptions that the Bible makes about the nature of human society and its moral foundations” by closely analysing not only the meaning of Lev 19:18 in context but its broader contribution to OT ethics.¹¹

Despite the voluminous literature on the love of neighbour, studies that aim to examine the ancient reception of Lev 19:18 are scant. However, two recent works of Mathys’s and of Tsuji’s probably have the most overlap with this thesis and will be described in some detail.

In his monograph, *Liebe deinen Nächsten wie dich selbst* (a revised Bern *Doktorarbeit* written under M. A. Klopfenstein), Hans-Peter Mathys carefully probes the meaning of Lev 19:18 in its original literary context and its sociological function in history.¹² At the outset, Mathys studies the individual, linguistic elements of the love command in the light of their wider usages in the HB and a handful of ANE sources. He contends that self-

10. Calum M. Carmichael, “Laws of Leviticus 19,” *HTR* 87(1994): 239–56.

11. Ronald Ernest Clements, *Loving One’s Neighbour: Old Testament Ethics in Context: The Ethel M Wood Lecture, 4 March 1992* (London: University of London, 1992), 22. Other recent works in this category include: Edmund N. Santurri and William Werpehowski, eds., *The Love Commandments: Essays in Christian Ethics and Moral Philosophy* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1992); Lenn E. Goodman, *Love Thy Neighbour As Thyself* (Oxford: OUP, 2008). The tradition of linking neighbourly love to self-love continues well into the critical period as these works attest. See also Barton’s recent contribution: John Barton, *Ethics in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: OUP, 2014).

12. Hans-Peter Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten wie dich selbst: Untersuchungen zum alttestamentlichen Gebot der Nächstenliebe (Lev 19, 18)*, OBO 71 (Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 1986).

love—a concept not foreign in the HB (cf. Deut 10:16-19; 1 Sam 18:1, 3; 20:17; Prov 17:17; 19:8)—forms the basis of Lev 19:18.¹³ He analyses the various shades of meaning of רַע and related terms in the Book of the Covenant (BC), Deuteronomy and the Holiness Code (H), as he also considers the meaning of כְּמוֹד.¹⁴ Mathys then situates Lev 19:18 in concentric circles of contexts, that is, within Lev 19:11-18,¹⁵ then within Lev 19 as a whole, and then within H. According to Mathys, H makes a distinct and theologically new demand on *all* of Israel, which is encapsulated by the call to be קָדַשׁ in Lev 19:2.¹⁶

The ensuing section (“IV. Die historische Verortung des Liebesgebote”) attempts to locate the levitical love command in its *Sitz(e) im Leben* (i.e., exilic and postexilic) and to trace the changes in its function from the preexilic to postexilic periods. Here, he explores the sociological function of Lev 19:17-18 in the postexilic community. Building on the insights of Causse and Weber, Mathys advances the theory that a much more stringent “Gehorsamsforderung” of “die Binnenethik” as defined by H, of which Lev 19:17-18 forms a vital part, functioned “in einer Glaubensgemeinschaft” of Israel as a strategy to survive the Exile. In other words, if the people of Israel were to maintain their distinctive identity as God’s people under the

13. There is “keinen neutralen Begriff der Selbstliebe. Es gibt nur richtige und falsche Selbstliebe.” Ibid., 14. According to Mathys, Lev 19:18 is exemplified in “die Geschichte von Jonathan und David, die von der schönsten, tiefsten und vielschichtigsten Freundschaft.” He also sees a corresponding sentiment between Gilgamesh and Enkidu in the Epic of Gilgamesh. Ibid.

14. Mathys asserts that H “hat die deuteronomische Brüderlichkeitssprache weitergeführt.” Ibid., 37.

15. Mathys thinks the love of neighbour was “ursprünglich also ein Gebot der Feindsiebe, und erst wenn man es aus seinem Kontext löst, wird es zu einem allgemeinen Liebesgebot.” Ibid., 81.

16. Ibid., 104. Mathys notes that the love command “bezieht sich auf den Glaubensbruder und nicht nur den wirtschaftlichen Schwachen oder sonst irgendwie Benachteiligten.” Ibid., 117.

immense, external pressure that propelled them to assimilate, they had to live in solidarity *by their own volition*.¹⁷ One could no longer belong automatically to the religious community of Israel by birth. This “tightening up” of the communal boundary reflects the transition from a primarily, or even purely, ethnic definition (the “alten Sippenbrüderlichkeit”) of what it means to be God’s people to a more religious one (i.e., “Glaubensbrüder”).¹⁸ Mathys avers, “Das nachexilische Israel war also faktisch konfessioneller Verband, Gemeinde, obwohl es sich immer noch als ‘Volk’ und unmittelbare Fortsetzerin des vorexilischen Israel begriff.”¹⁹ Mathys posits that such a situation is reflected in the postexilic reform programmes of Ezra and Nehemiah. The definition of who is in and who is out was as exigent as it was controversial that “in der Kultusgemeinde Konflikte von ihrem Anspruch her, ideale Gemeinschaft zu sein” were threatening to tear the community apart.²⁰ In the face of such a crisis, only the practice of the love of neighbour could foster the bond that would preserve the communal cohesion.²¹ Ezra and Nehemiah programmatically employed Lev 19:17-18 as an urgent solution to the threat of conflicting ideals among the members of this new religious association.

The final chapter (“V. Der systematische Ort des Liebesgebotes”) shifts gears and probes whether or not the levitical love command is at the centre (“die Mitte”) of OT ethics. Mathys asks whether or not the Double Love Command (the love of God and the love of neighbour) can be found in the HB. Although he concludes in the negative, he notes nevertheless that the

17. Ibid., 127-28.

18. Ibid., 127.

19. Ibid., 137.

20. Ibid., 140.

21. Ibid.

loose association of these notions can be found already in the Decalogue.

This final chapter is slightly different from the rest, being more like a biblical-theological consideration of the place of Lev 19:18 in OT ethics.

Mathys's study is a helpful reference work, and it will be especially useful in considering the original meaning of Lev 19:18 (Ch.2). However, as he hardly deals with the subsequent reception of Lev 19:18 in detail, the overlap between his work and this thesis remains limited.

The other work is by Manabu Tsuji of Hiroshima University who published a lesser-known book, *Rinjin aino hajimari: seishogakuteki kōsatsu* (隣人愛のはじまりー聖書学的考察), in Japanese.²² This recent work takes the aforementioned approach of Moffatt, Spicq, Furnish, and Lütgert, albeit with an exclusive focus on the love of neighbour. Tsuji's work contains a strong *wirkungsgeschichtlich* element, although he never articulates the aim as such. He examines the historical development of the teaching on neighbourly love in early Christianity, as he problematises at the outset the common harmonisation of the love of neighbour in the Synoptic Gospels. He detects a definitive difference between Jesus' attitudes towards the (teaching of the) love of neighbour in the Markan version (more or less followed by Matthew) and the Lukan version.²³ Tsuji thinks the Lukan version reflects the attitude

22. Manabu Tsuji, *The Beginning of the Love of Neighbour: A Biblical-critical Investigation* (Tokyo: Shikyo Publishing, 2010). All translation of Tsuji's work is my own.

As a Japanese NT scholar who was trained in Osaka and (like Mathys) in Bern, Tsuji mainly publishes in Japanese and in German (including his revised Bern thesis), but some of his recent publications are in English. Idem, *Glaube zwischen Vollkommenheit und Verweltlichung: Eine Untersuchung zur literarischen Gestalt und zur inhaltlichen Kohärenz des Jakobusbriefes*, WUNT 2/93 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997); idem, "Zwischen Ideal und Realität: Zu den Witwen in 1 Tim 5.3-16," *NTS* 47 (2001): 92-104; idem, "Persönliche Korrespondenz des Paulus: Zur Strategie der Pastoralbriefe als Pseudepigrapha," *NTS* 56 (2010): 253-72; idem, "II Tim 1:6: Laying on of Hands by Paul for Ordination?," *AJBI* 39 (2013).

23. Tsuji, *The Beginning*, 17-21.

of the historical Jesus who, contrary to popular opinion, did not endorse the teaching of the love of neighbour.²⁴ The love of neighbour was founded upon the idea of reciprocity and upheld by the lawyer and his contemporaries, as the fact that the lawyer is able to answer his own question in the Lukan version testifies. Tsuji postulates that Jesus was familiar with those who affirmed the Double Love Command tradition with words yet contradicted it in action, especially by the way they treated the Samaritans.²⁵ Seen against this historical backdrop, Jesus was not a proponent but rather an opponent of the orthodoxy of the love of neighbour (Luke 6:32; Matt 5:46). According to Tsuji, rather than reinterpret the command to love the neighbour, Jesus firmly rejected it and championed the love of enemy *over against* the love of neighbour. Tsuji reasons that if the Lukan version is more historical, then the Markan (and the Matthean) version in which Jesus is depicted as a staunch advocate of the love of neighbour can only be a product of subsequent Christian redaction. This Christian redaction most likely reflects the early Jewish Christian concern for gentile inclusion.²⁶

With these assumptions in mind, Tsuji ventures to identify the inception of the teaching on the love of neighbour and its subsequent development. He first turns to Lev 19:18 and traces the changing interpretation of the love of neighbour in a chronological order all the way up to the second century CE (e.g., Didache, II Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas). Tsuji argues that there is no reason why one should restrict the

24. Tsuji maintains that the Double Love Command pericope originally contained the parable of the Good Samaritan, which was Jesus' incisive critique of the established understanding of the love of neighbour (see Ch.5).

25. Ibid., 35.

26. Tsuji adheres to the Two Document hypothesis and thinks Luke had a Markan source and some sort of Q before him. However, he argues that Luke probably drew from an independent, non-Markan source that was more historical (see Ch.5).

definition of the neighbour in Lev 19:18 to ethnic Israelites but the text seems to define the neighbour as anyone who was geographically part of the community (as evidenced by the inclusion of the גר at Lev 19:33-34). It was only in the wake of the Exile and the subsequent encounter with Hellenistic culture when the ethnocentric definition of the neighbour—which the historical Jesus opposed—emerged, as the Jews struggled to maintain their communal identity. Tsuji points out that two, seemingly contradictory tendencies emerge during the Second Temple period. On the one hand, the desire to construct and preserve Jewish identity gave rise to a narrow, ethnocentric definition of the neighbour (the narrowness which, according to Tsuji, is not found in Lev). On the other hand, a “universalising” tendency can also be seen, especially among Hellenistic Jewish writers (e.g., the LXX translators, Baruch, Aristeas, Philo) who desired to propagate and promote Judaism to the wider Hellenistic world. The tradition of summarising the whole Torah with the fear of God and the love of (or justice for) humankind was an adaptation of a Hellenistic practice.²⁷ He maintains that these two seemingly incompatible streams of thought (viz., particularism and universalism) existed side by side in Second Temple Judaism and converged in the establishment of the teaching on the love of neighbour, which the Lukan lawyer knew. Despite the fact that the historical Jesus himself opposed the love of neighbour, the early Jewish Christians came to ascribe great importance to the love of neighbour as the key teaching of Jesus. The growing emphasis on the love of neighbour owes first and foremost to Paul’s missionary activity and the concomitant challenges of gentile inclusion, which engendered the redefinition the neighbour in the early church.²⁸ The

27. Ibid., 60-65.

rest of the book traces the chronological development of the particularistic and universalist attitudes in early Christianity.

Tsuji's work is helpful and advances an intriguing thesis. His aim and scope are far broader than that of this thesis. However, the breadth of his work seems to be a double-edged sword. The investigation of the texts—especially extra-biblical, Second Temple sources—is broad-brush at best, lacking in sustained exegetical analyses. In several places, important exegetical issues are scarcely discussed, and he simply asserts rather than argues for his positions.²⁹ His scholarly interaction in the book is, unfortunately, confined mostly to Japanese and German scholarship. Perhaps too much hangs on the “historicity” of the Lukan account over the Markan, and even here he does not really engage with other views. Moreover, the citations of and allusions to Lev 19:18 are only briefly and secondarily brought to bear on the discussion, and he devotes disproportionate space to first and second century CE material (less than one fifth of the book is dedicated to Second Temple literature). In short, the reception of Lev 19:18 in the Second Temple period is not studied in its own right.³⁰

1.3 Aim and scope

In view of the scholarly landscape delineated above, this thesis aims to identify and examine ancient Jewish reception of the love command of

28. Ibid., 84-85.

29. For instance, he opts for the adjectival usage of כַּמּוֹךְ in Lev 19:18 but only makes a passing reference to Schüle's recent work (see Ch.2). The issue of source and historicity with regards to the Double Love Command tradition is widely debated (see Ch.5), but Tsuji hardly examines other scholarly views on the issue.

30. Some limited aspects of the reception of Leviticus can be found in: Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A Kugler, eds., *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, VTSup 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

Leviticus. More specifically, the aim is to trace how the interpretation of Lev 19:18 developed within Jewish milieux during the Second Temple period, up to its emergence as the greatest command in the NT. The thesis seeks to fill, if partially, the gap between the love command as an important command among many in Lev 19:18 to the love command as the sublime ethical and summary command in the NT. If Lev 19:18, or more broadly H, was already set in place by the postexilic, Persian period *at the latest*, then one is justified in asking how Lev 19:18 was received thereafter.³¹ Historical-critical investigations of Leviticus have expended much energy deciphering the textual history of Leviticus prior to the formation of Leviticus while literary studies have focussed expressly and sometimes exclusively on synchronic analyses of the text. For this thesis, the synchronic meaning of Lev 19 is important, but equally significant is its diachronic dimension. However, the focus is not on the compositional history of the love command prior to its formation as Lev 19:18 but on tracing the interpretation of this levitical love command by its subsequent readers. If the later interpreters of Lev 19:18 did not read the Pentateuchal texts as J/E, P/H, or D, but rather more like Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, then the shape of the underlying sources (*Vorlagen*) are only indirectly relevant for our consideration.³²

31. Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*, FAT 2/25 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 545-59.

32. As useful and necessary the distinction between the text *as produced* (the formation of a text) and *as received* (its reception history) is, these categories are neat only at the conceptual level. The process of textual production is also a process of reception from a different perspective. For instance, if BC was an independent source prior to the composition of Priestly source/writing (P) and/or the Holiness Code (H), and if P/H reinterpreted and incorporated BC into its composition, then P/H tells two stories. On the one hand, the incorporation of BC into or redaction of BC by P/H is in any case a form of reception of BC. On the other hand, this reception of BC is simultaneously part of the production process of

Reception history is increasingly becoming a focal point of scholarly interest. One recent and major undertaking, *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception* (EBR), is a clear witness of this trend. EBR is an ambitious, international, multi-volume, highly inter-disciplinary and collaborative project that sets out with the conviction that biblical texts “not only have their own particular backgrounds and settings but have also been received and interpreted, and have exerted influence or otherwise have had impact in countless religious, theological, and aesthetic settings.”³³ Although most modern biblical scholars would profess the importance of reception history, it has not always been appreciated in the academia. EBR identifies the following problem:

The rapid expansion of knowledge in biblical studies is exhilarating but also creates complex difficulties, especially those associated with the splitting of the field into ever-multiplying areas of specialization. No biblical scholar today, whatever part or aspect of the Bible he or she may specialize in, can master the pertinent current research without confining his or her interests to a single biblical writing, a very limited period, or a particular approach. Clearly, the view of the “whole” is ever more remote. Furthermore, the proliferation of languages in scholarly literature has heightened the challenge of communication.³⁴

In view of this challenge, EBR maintains a twofold aim:

(1) comprehensively recording – and, indeed, advancing – the current knowledge of the origins and development of the Bible in its Jewish and Christian canonical forms and (2) documenting the history of the Bible’s

P/H. As such, the production-reception process is multiplex and continuous.

33. Hans-Josef Klauck et al., eds., “Introduction,” EBR 1:ix. Also see: John F. A. Sawyer, ed., *The Blackwell Companion to the Bible and Culture* (Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons, 2012), 1-7; idem, *The Fifth Gospel: Isaiah in the History of Christianity* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996).

34. Klauck et al., “Introduction,” x.

reception in Judaism and Christianity as evident in exegetical literature, theological and philosophical writings of various genres, literature, liturgy, music, the visual arts, dance, and film, as well as in Islam and other religious traditions and contemporary movements.³⁵

“Reception history” broadly defined encompasses far more than textual or literary reception. One could try to analyse how a biblical story was portrayed in medieval paintings or how the architecture of a modern building was inspired by the Jerusalem Temple or even how the theme of neighbourly love is encoded into a contemporary song. However, the aim and the scope of this thesis will be far more modest. It will trace only the earliest reception of Lev 19:18 in a number of ancient Jewish texts mainly from the Second Temple period by engaging in a series of sustained exegetical analyses.

1.4 Lev 19:18 in Second Temple Jewish literature

Recently, Lange and Weigold compiled all the biblical quotations and allusions in the HB and Jewish literature from the Second Temple period. In this reference work, they list the following for Lev 19:18: CD 6:20-21; 9:2; 4QD^a (4Q266) 8 ii 10; 4QD^d (4Q269) 4 ii 2; 4QD^e (4Q270) 6 iii 16-17; 5QD (5Q12) 1:2; Sir 13:15 (MS-A); Jub 7:20; *Let. Aris.* 228; *T. Iss.* 5:2; *T. Gad* 4:2; *T.*

35. Ibid., ix.

Benj. 3:3-4.³⁶ Of these, the ones that cite Lev 19:18b are confined to: Jub 7:20; CD 6:20-21; and 4QD^d (4Q269) 4 ii 2 (see below on *T. 12 Patr.*).

The perusal of manuscripts that contain Lev 19:18 shows that Lev 19:18 has been orthographically very stable. No text-critical variants of any substance can be found. The examination of various translational works, such as, the Septuagint or the Aramaic Targumim (Neofiti 1, Pseudo-Jonathan, Onqelos), also raises no question about the *phraseology* of Lev 19:18 itself either. Even the Samaritan Pentateuch, which often exhibits minor but numerous orthographical variations from the Masoretic Text, attests no difference in this case. The excavation of the DSS has yielded several fragments of Leviticus, but even these reveal no real difference in the *wording* of the love command.³⁷

However, one commonly cited source the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* will be omitted from this thesis. The highly developed uses of the Double Love Command tradition in *T. 12 Patr.* (*T. Iss.* 5:2; *T. Gad* 4:2; *T. Benj.* 3:3-4) seem to depend heavily on the Gospels.³⁸ Even if it were possible to

36. Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*, Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 5 (Göttingen: V&R, 2011), 84. They employ the new INFER feature of Accordance to mine data from available electronic databases.

Ruzer thinks *Let. Aris.* evidences a new and more universalist interpretative direction in Judaism. Ruzer, *Mapping*, 48-53. However, *Let. Aris.* does not cite Lev 19:18 and the alleged allusion to Lev 19:18 is so vague that it could have very well come from other Jewish sources (e.g., Sapiential texts).

37. 1QpalaeoLev (1Q3); 2QpalaeoLev (2Q2-4); 4QExod-Lev^f (4Q17); 4QLev-Num^a (4Q23); 4QLev^{b-g} (4Q24-26); 4QcryptA Lev^h (4Q249ⁱ); 4QtgLev (4Q156); 6QpalaeoLev (5Q2); 11Q1-2.

38. The issues of the origin, date and source continue to be widely debated, but most scholars think that *T. 12 Patr.* has a lengthy compositional-redactional history. While most now think that *T. 12 Patr.* probably originated in Jewish circles, the final form (for which only medieval manuscripts are available) clearly comes from Christian hands. Some continue to maintain that the original, Jewish layers can be isolated through literary-critical or text-critical investigations, but those who follow the Leiden school (spearheaded by M. de Jonge) rightly insist that such an undertaking is probably unattainable. H. Dixon

identify and separate out some pre-Christian, Jewish layers within *T. 12 Patr.*, this does not seem to apply to the Double Love Command tradition, as de Jonge contends.³⁹ Meier also omits the consideration of *T. 12 Patr.* in his quest to surmise whether or not the Double Love Command tradition goes back to the historical Jesus. He justifies the exclusion of *T. 12 Patr.* based on three factors: [i] the highly debatable date and provenance of *T. 12 Patr.*, [ii] the clear evidence of Christian authorship of or influence on the final form, and [iii] the fact that many moral exhortations permeating *T. 12 Patr.* are of a generic Stoic type.⁴⁰ Given these difficulties, using *T. 12 Patr.* as evidence for the reception of Lev 19:18 in the Second Temple period is problematic, and it muddles rather than clarifies the focus of our investigation.

1.5 Course of analysis

Following this introductory chapter, this thesis will be divided into four main chapters and Conclusion. Chapter Two will carefully consider the two-fold love command of Lev 19 (vv.18, 34), paying particularly close attention to the four key words and their wider linguistic usages. Chapter Three will probe the translation of Lev 19:18 in the LXX and then the interpretation of Lev 19:18 in the Book of Jubilees. Chapter Four will analyse the citation of Lev 19:18 in the Damascus Document and the interpretation of

Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977); Robert Kugler, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Guides to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* 10 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 31-40.

39. Marinus de Jonge, "The Two Great Commandments in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *NT* 44 (2002): 371-92.

40. Meier, *Marginal Jew*, IV:507-8. Adela Yarbro Collins also observes that "the *T. 12 Patr.* speaks about loving both God and neighbor in the same context, but the Christian transmission of this document precludes using it with assurance as evidence for the attestation of the double love-command independently of the Gospels." Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, *Hermeneia* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 569.

Lev 19:18 in the Community Rule. Chapter Five will investigate the six citations of Lev 19:18 in the NT.⁴¹ Finally, Chapter Six will conclude this thesis by recapitulating the main findings of each chapter and by sketching a “thicker” Jewish reception of Lev 19:18 in the Second Temple period.

41. Given that the first generation of Jesus-believers were *Jewish* believers who probably lived and wrote as Jews, I treat the NT texts as a witness not only to Christian but also to Jewish history of interpretation.

Chapter Two

The Love Command in Leviticus

2.1 Introduction

In probing a reception history of any given text, one ought to determine first its original meaning. Our quest begins in Leviticus where the earliest attestation of the priestly command to love one's neighbour (19:18) is found. This chapter will probe the meaning of Lev 19:18 in its literary context.

2.2 A brief overview of scholarship on Leviticus

Modern English commentaries often bewail the neglect of the study of Leviticus, but the recent scholarly output on Leviticus belies such a bleak picture. In addition to some of the landmark German commentaries,⁴² a number of English commentaries and several monographs with various foci have appeared.⁴³ Recent studies continue to pose historical-critical questions

42. August Dillmann, *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*, Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 12 (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1897); Arnold B. Ehrlich, *Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium*, vol. 2 of *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel: Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909); Martin Noth, *Das Dritte Buch Mose, Leviticus*, ATD 6 (Göttingen: V&R, 1963); idem, *Leviticus*, trans. J. E. Anderson, OTL (London: SCM Press, 1965); Karl Elliger, *Leviticus*, HAT 4 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1966); Erhard S. Gerstenberger, *Das dritte Buch Mose Leviticus*, ATD 6 (Göttingen: V&R, 1993); idem, *Leviticus*, trans. Douglas W. Stott, OTL (Louisville: WJKP, 1996); Rolf Rendtorff, *Leviticus*, BKAT 3 (Neukirchner-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2004).

that are in keeping with the traditional aims of Pentateuchal Criticism, namely, the compositional-redactional history of the Pentateuch in tandem with the more general history of ancient Israel.⁴⁴ These studies usually attempt to discern source-critical divisions within Leviticus in order to delineate the book's diachronic development, and rarely do they seek to understand Leviticus as literature.⁴⁵ In response to such a tendency, a number of literary studies search for the structural integrity of the book and

43. J. R. Porter, *Leviticus: A Commentary*, Cambridge Bible Commentary (Cambridge: CUP, 1976); Baruch A. Levine, *Leviticus: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*, JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: JPS, 1989); John E. Hartley, *Leviticus*, WBC 4 (Dallas: Word, 1992); Gordon J. Wenham, *Book of Leviticus*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995); Samuel E. Balentine, *Leviticus*, IBC (Louisville: WJKP, 2002); Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1991); idem, *Leviticus 17-22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB 3A (New Haven: YUP, 2000); idem, *Leviticus 23-27: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB 3B (New Haven: YUP, 2001); idem, *Leviticus: A Book of Ritual and Ethics*, CC (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004); Nobuyoshi Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, ApOTC 3 (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 2007); Ephraim Radner, *Leviticus*, SCM Theological Commentary on the Bible (London: SCM Press, 2008); Mark W. Elliot, *Engaging Leviticus: Reading Leviticus Theologically with Its Past Interpreters* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2011). For surveys of scholarship on Leviticus, see: Philip P. Jenson, *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World*, JSOTSup 106 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992); Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 4–11; Wilfried Warning, *Literary Artistry in Leviticus*, BibInt 35 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1–35.

44. For overviews and recent discussions of Pentateuchal Criticism, see: G. I. Davies, "Introduction to the Pentateuch," in *OBC* (Oxford: OUP, 2007), 12–38; Ernest Nicholson, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2002); Thomas B. Dozeman, Thomas Römer, and Konrad Schmid, eds., *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings*, AIL 8 (Atlanta: SBL, 2011); Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz, eds., *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, FAT 78 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011). See also Baden's recent work that attempts to refine and advance afresh the Documentary Hypothesis. He holds that the Pentateuch contains four distinct sources and a single redactor. Joel S. Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*, AYBRL (New Haven: YUP, 2012).

45. Oft-quoted Noth's (in)famous comment perhaps encapsulates this point: "In its transmitted form, this codex [i.e., Lev 19] is indeed remarkably diverse and disordered. ...the different departments of life are arranged very much at random." Noth, *Leviticus*, 138.

examine how the law and narrative relate to each other in Leviticus and, more broadly, in the Pentateuch as a whole.⁴⁶

Today, Lev 19 is viewed almost unanimously as the central chapter of the Holiness Code (H).⁴⁷ Since the nineteenth century, Leviticus has been typically divided into two sections: chs.1-16 (+27 as an appendix) and chs.17-26. The nomenclature of H is attributed to August Klostermann who

46. For example, Douglas points out that Leviticus defies the modern sense of "literariness," and argues, "Our modern convention of reading requires a strong linear connection. An archaic legend is judged obscure by a later generation unfamiliar with the genre, when the narrative thread is weak. If it is a legal text, it will be judged coherent according to the strength of the logical thread. Neither complaint is lodged against Leviticus. It is not obscure or incoherent, but it is highly repetitious. It is likely to be misunderstood if taken to be a list of cultic instructions whose background of thought needs to be explained, instead of a profound theological treatise in its own right." Mary Douglas, "Poetic Structure in Leviticus," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*, ed. David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman et al. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 243. Also see: idem, *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford: OUP, 2001); Calum M. Carmichael, *Illuminating Leviticus: A Study of Its Laws and Institutions in the Light of Biblical Narratives* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006); Anselm C. Hagedorn, "Taking the Pentateuch to the Twenty-First Century," *ExpTim* 119 (2007): 53–58; John Barton, "Law and Narrative in the Pentateuch," *Communio Viatorum* 51 (2009): 126–40; Assnat Bartor, *Reading Law as Narrative: A Study in the Casuistic Laws of the Pentateuch*, AIL 5 (Atlanta: SBL, 2010).

Another interesting and fruitful area of research on Leviticus is the concept of purity and defilement. In addition to classic and numerous works of Jacob Neusner, see: Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concept of Pollution and Taboo*, Routledge Classics (London: Routledge & Kegan, 1996); Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: OUP, 2000); Christine E. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (Oxford: OUP, 2002); John G. Gammie, *Holiness in Israel*, OBT (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2005); Baruch J. Schwartz et al., eds., *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible*, LHBOTS 474 (London: T&T Clark, 2008).

47. For *Forschungsgeschichte* on H, see: Henry T. C. Sun, "An Investigation into the Compositional Integrity of the So-Called Holiness Code (Leviticus 17-26)" (PhD diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1990), 1-43; idem, "Holiness Code," *ABD* III:254-57; Jan Joosten, *People and Land in the Holiness Code: An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17-26*, VTSup 67 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 5-27; Klaus Grünwaldt, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz Leviticus 17-26: Ursprüngliche Gestalt, Tradition und Theologie*, BZAW 271 (Berlin: WdG, 1999), 5-22; Andreas Ruwe, "Heiligkeitgesetz" und "Priesterschrift": *Literaturgeschichtliche und rechtssystematische Untersuchungen zu Leviticus 17,1-26,2*, FAT 26 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 5-35; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 1-19.

named this corpus “*das Heiligkeitgesetz*” (“The Holiness Code”) in 1877. The classic order of H --> a narrative *Grundschrift* (Pg) --> “*sekundär*” priestly additions (Ps) has been long maintained since Wellhausen.⁴⁸ While the early scholarly *opinio communis* held H to be an independent, pre-P source that was later incorporated into P by a single redactor (Graf, Klostermann, Wellhausen, Bertholet, Baentsch, Driver; albeit disagreements abounded at the level of detail), some argued that H was never an independent corpus (Eerdman, Küchler).⁴⁹ Others detect multiple redactional layers within H itself (Baentsch, Cholewiński) or see H as a series of redactional supplements rather than a source (Reventlow, Kilian, Elliger, Sun), which adds significant complexity to the relation between P and H.⁵⁰ In the recent decades, some have ventured to take H’s synchronic dimension more seriously and examined the ideational framework of H as a coherent whole (Gründwält, Joosten, Ruwe).⁵¹

More recently, Knohl developed Kaufmann’s view and argued that H was not “a unit (and even special unit) embedded within the comprehensive work of P”; rather, P and H are two separate sources or “the work of two

48. August Klostermann, *Der Pentateuch: Beiträge zu seinem Verständnis und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1893); Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, trans. J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies (Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black, 1885).

49. S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 9th ed., International Theological Library (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1913), 47-59; Bruno Baentsch, *Das Heiligkeit-Gesetz Lev. XVII-XXVI* (Erfurt: H. Güther, 1893); B. D. Eerdmans, *Das Buch Leviticus*, vol. 4 of *Alttestamentliche Studien* (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1912); Siegfried Küchler, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz: Lev. 17-26. Eine literar-kritische Untersuchung* (Königsberg: Kümmel, 1929).

50. Henning Reventlow, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz: Formgeschichtlich untersucht* (Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961); Rudolf Kilian, *Literarkritische und formgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Heiligkeitgesetzes*, BBB 19 (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1963); A. Cholewiński, *Heiligkeitgesetz und Deuteronomium: Eine vergleichende Studie*, AnBib 66 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976); Sun, “An Investigation.”

51. Joosten, *People and Land*; Gründwält, *Heiligkeitgesetz*; Ruwe, “*Heiligkeitgesetz*.”

independent Priestly schools.”⁵² Knohl thinks H (composed in Jerusalem by the “Holiness School” [HS] sometime between 743-701 BCE) postdates P (produced in mid-tenth to mid-eighth century BCE by an older priestly school, namely, the “Priestly Torah” [PT]). HS grew out of PT in the wake of “political, social, cultural, and religious upheavals” of the eight century BCE and is responsible for the editing of PT and even the Torah. As such, Priestly Source (PS) is a product of a long and multileveled process “that began with the composition of the various PT strata, continued with the various stages in HS’s creative activity, and terminated with the final editing of the ‘Priestly source’ and the Pentateuch as a whole.”⁵³ Milgrom follows Knohl, albeit with some modification. He believes that terminological analysis provides the best control for proving the antiquity of P.⁵⁴ Milgrom holds that H is also mostly preexilic, and it presumes, supplements and revises P. Yet, H was not a “school” since “over 95 percent of the H material can be attributed to the product of the eight century.”⁵⁵ Thus, both the date and the nature of P and H continue to be widely debated.⁵⁶ Yet, as Nihan rightly notes, “On the whole,

52. Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1995), 6.

53. Ibid., 200-4, 209, 220-23.

54. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 3-35; idem, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1332-64; Avi Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1982); idem, “The Language of the Priestly Source and Its Historical Setting—The Case for an Early Date,” in *Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies, August 16-21, 1981, Panel Sessions: Bible Studies and Hebrew Language* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1983), 83-94; idem, “The Historical Quest for ‘Ancient Israel’ and the Linguistic Evidence of the Hebrew Bible: Some Methodological Observations,” *VT* 47 (1997): 301-15.

55. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1345, 1361-64. See also: idem, “Priestly (‘P’) Source,” *ABD* V:454-61.

56. While the notion that the Pentateuch was composed of a collection of fragments or sources did not originate with Julius Wellhausen, he is named as the one who carefully refined and pushed the ascendancy of the theory. Since his seminal work, *Prolegomena to The History of Israel*, the classical Documentary Hypothesis (a.k.a. J-E-D-P Theory) has been highly influential. Although the proponents of Supplementary Hypothesis (Ewald) and its critics (e.g., Hupfeld) tended to see the priestly narrative (the Book of Origins) as the earliest

it can be said that the traditional chronology for H and P has been radically reversed in recent decades.”⁵⁷

2.3 The love of neighbour in context

The love command appears twice in ch.19 with two different objects (רַעַךְ and the גֵּר) and a careful qualifier (בְּמוֹד). I will first touch on some preliminary issues and then examine the love commands in their respective literary contexts (viz., vv.11-18 and vv.33-34). I will work through some key exegetical issues, as I pay special attention to the four key terms (אָהַב, רַעַךְ, גֵּר, בְּמוֹד) with their broader usages in mind. Then I will conclude this chapter by proposing the best construal and translation of Lev 19:18.

layer or source (hence P-E-J-D), with the advent of Wellhausen’s work, both the existence and the relative lateness of P emerged as a consensus—although some (like Cross) argue that P is a redaction and never existed as an independent source. Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 293-325. Blum follows Cross but thinks neither “source” nor “redaction” is the right term and prefers “Komposition.” Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, BZAW 189 (Berlin: WdG, 1990).

However, Kaufmann has from early on disputed the lateness of P. He dates P to the preexilic period and contends, “Each of the three codes of the Torah [i.e., JE, P, D] is to be regarded as an independent crystallization of Israel’s ancient juristic-moral literature.” Y. Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel: From its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile*, trans. Moshe Greenberg (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1961), 170. Kaufmann observes that the Torah “is the literary product of the earliest stage of Israelite religion, the stage prior to literary prophecy. Although its compilation and canonization took place later, its sources are demonstrably ancient—not in part, not in their general content, but in their entirety, even to their language and formulation.” *Ibid.*, 2. Haran also develops this line of reasoning. Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978). Milgrom thinks Dillmann, Kaufmann and Haran all fell victim to “the objection that historical reconstruction never leaves the realm of speculation.” Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 3.

57. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 10.

2.3.1 Some preliminary remarks

The overall literary structure of Leviticus is debated in spite of the concerted effort of some to settle the issue.⁵⁸ Most scholars nevertheless recognise the importance of ch.19 in the book, and most take either ch.16 or ch.19 as the centre of the book.⁵⁹ This study makes no attempt to determine the structural centre of Leviticus, but suffice it to say, on most reckoning (i.e., thematic, redaction-critical, biblical-theological), ch.19 is one of the key chapters in the book, and the love command of v.18 occupies a vital place in the chapter.

In the same vein, the structure of ch.19 continues to be debated, but the uniqueness of ch.19 is highlighted by the thematic repetition of 18:6-23

58. Warning analyses the entire structure of Leviticus based on terminological patterns (i.e., the thirty-seven occurrences of the divine speech formulae) and argues for the compositional integrity (i.e., single-handed authorship) of Leviticus. Warning, *Literary Artistry*, 177. For an overview of scholarship on the macro-structure of Leviticus, see: Didier Luciani, *Structure littéraire du Lévitique*, vol. 1 of *Sainteté et pardon*, BETL 185A (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 207-41; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 76-110. Also: Yehuda T. Radday, "Chiasmus in Hebrew Biblical Narrative," in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*, ed. John W. Welch (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1981), 50-117; W. H. Shea, "Literary Form and Theological Function in Leviticus," in vol. 3 of *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 75-118; Christopher R. Smith, "The Literary Structure of Leviticus," *JSOT* 70 (1996): 17-32; Moshe Kline, "'The Editor Was Nodding': A Reading of Leviticus 19 in Memory of Mary Douglas," *JHBS* 8 (2008): 2-59.

I tentatively favour the ring-model of Douglas and Milgrom, as it seems to present perhaps the most cohesive picture of the synchronic structure of Leviticus. Mary Douglas, "The Forbidden Animals in Leviticus," *JSOT* 59 (1993): 3-23; idem, "Poetic Structure," 239-56; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1364-67. But Warning disagrees and points out that the ring-model is a structural analysis based on conceptual rather than terminological patterns. Warning, *Literary Artistry*, 15-17. Also: Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 18. Moreover, Nihan criticises the general tendency among scholars to disregard the wider Pentateuchal narrative in understanding the structure of Leviticus. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 88-89.

59. For instance, Nihan argues that ch.16 is the centre of the book. *Ibid.*, 95-99.

and 20:10-21, which effectively envelopes ch.19. Chs.18 and 20 together create the following nearly parallel structure:⁶⁰

	<i>a</i>	<i>vv.1-5</i>	<i>Introductory exhortation</i>
	<i>b</i>	<i>vv.6-20, 22-23</i>	<i>Sexual relations</i>
<i>A ch.18</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>v.21</i>	<i>Molech worship</i>
	<i>d</i>	<i>vv.24-30</i>	<i>Closing exhortation/warning</i>
<i>X ch.19</i>			
	<i>a'</i>	<i>v.1</i>	<i>Introductory exhortation</i>
	<i>c'</i>	<i>vv.2-5</i>	<i>Molech worship</i>
<i>A' ch.20</i>	<i>b'</i>	<i>vv.10-21</i>	<i>Sexual relations</i>
	<i>d'</i>	<i>vv.22-27</i>	<i>Closing exhortation/warning</i>

One of the salient characteristics of ch.19 is the repetition of the longer **אני יהוה** and the shorter **אני יהוה אלהיכם** formulae, which occur sixteen times in this chapter alone—far more frequently than any other chapter in the HB. They serve two functions: [i] to divide the chapter into smaller, coherent units, and [ii] to act as motivational clauses that undergird the commands.⁶¹ Milgrom insightfully observes that even the number of their occurrences is designed to match the chapter's theme (i.e., seven which signifies perfection and completion).⁶²

אני יהוה אלהיכם	1 [<i>v.2: Introduction</i>]	+ 7 [<i>vv.3, 4, 10, 25, 31, 34, 36</i>]
אני יהוה	7 [<i>vv.12, 14, 16, 18, 28, 30, 32</i>]	+ 1 [<i>v.37: Closing</i>]

60. See Nihan's argument for the structural unity of Lev 18-20: Ibid., 430-81.

61. Warning, *Literary Artistry*, 107-9.

62. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1324. It is slightly odd, however, that several clearly marked units actually appear without either of these structural markers (i.e., vv.5-8, v.19, vv.20-22, and v.29), but this can be explained on stylistic grounds: all these units terminate in third person and thus cannot be followed by a formula whose first-person subject is addressing a second person. Ibid., 1597.

This structural artistry is no accident. Lev 19 as it stands nicely melds commands that pertain to various aspects of life. Wenham fittingly states, “The diversity of material in this chapter reflects the differentiation of life. All aspects of human affairs are subject to God’s law.”⁶³ The content and the structure of ch.19 may be delineated as follows:⁶⁴

A. Introduction

- v.1 Introduction
- v.2 General heading: “Be holy”

B. Religious Duties

- v.3 Revere parents and the sabbath
- v.4 Prohibition of idolatry
- vv.5-8 On the שלמים
- vv.9-10 Horticultural procedure (part 1): charity for the needy

C. Ethical commands

- vv.11-12 Deal honestly with the neighbour
- vv.13-14 Warning against exploitation and economic oppression
- vv.15-16 Justice and integrity in court
- vv.17-18 Do not hate; love your neighbour

D. Miscellaneous duties

- v.19a Secondary heading: “keep my statutes”
- v.19b No mix breeding
- vv.20-22 On the betrothed slave woman
- vv.23-25 Horticultural procedure (part 2)
- vv.26-28 Prohibition against eating blood / pagan practices (part 1)
- v.29 Prohibition of prostitution

E. Miscellaneous duties (continued)

- v.30 Revere the sabbath and the sanctuary

63. Wenham, *Leviticus*, 264. Kaminsky also notes, “Leviticus conceptualizes holiness as a unity of proper ethical and ritual conduct and also affirms that religion is not a private matter between each individual and God.” Joel S. Kaminsky, “Loving One’s (Israelite) Neighbor: Election and Commandment in Leviticus 19,” *Interpretation* 62 (2008): 125.

64. Most scholars identify some form of the Decalogue (or dodecalogue) in this chapter. This apparently shows that either the Decalogue was composed out of these prohibitions preserved in Lev 19 or Lev 19 was composed as an amplification of the Decalogue. See, Milgrom’s summary: Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1600-2. Also, Julian Morgenstern, “The Decalogue of the Holiness Code,” *HUCA* 26 (1955): 1-27.

v.31	Prohibition against pagan practices (part 2)
v.32	Revere the elderly and God
vv.33-34	Do not oppress; love the alien
vv.35-36	Honest measures and scale
F. Conclusion	
v.37	Closing exhortation: “keep my statutes and decrees”

Leviticus 19 consists roughly of two panels. Although exegetes disagree on the minutiae, most agree that vv.3-18 forms the first half of the commandments and vv.19-36 the latter half (note the nominal fronting observed in both v.3 and v.19, followed by the verb תשמרו).

In addition to the (אלהיכם) אני יהוה formulae, several other structural features stand out in this chapter: nominal fronting (object + את) followed by תשמרו (v.3, v.19), the repetition of שמר + חקתי (v.19, v.37), and the jussive of פנה negated with אל (v.4, v.31). Thematic repetitions and verbal parallelisms also abound: the sabbath (v.3, v.30), the fear of God (v.14, v.32), the call for justice in judgement (v.15, v.35), horticultural procedures (vv.9-10, vv.23-25), the command to love (v.18, v.34), and so forth.⁶⁵

Whatever the overall structure of ch.19, it is clear that all the commands in this chapter are appended to the introductory heading (vv.1-2). The entire chapter is governed by the exhortation to be holy (v.2). The levitical love command appears twice towards the end of the two panels (v.18, v.34). As Magonet articulates, “[N]ot merely the details of the laws but their organization and the very structure of the chapter itself convey meaning,” and the strategic placements of the love command reveal its

65. For a detailed structural analysis, see: Jonathan Magonet, “The Structure and Meaning of Leviticus 19,” *HAR* 7 (1983): 151–67; Luciani, *Sainteté et pardon*, I:100-110. Other proposals are summarised in: Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1597-1602; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 460-78.

significance.⁶⁶ As it will be shown below, v.18 has an important, summative function vis-à-vis vv.11-18, and vv.33-34 extends the commands of vv.11-18 to the גר in the form of an appendix.

2.3.2 Neighbour *par excellence* (19:11-18)

The levitical love command first appears with רעך as its object in 19:18. As v.18 stands as the conclusion of vv.11-18, the broader context of vv.11-18 needs to be taken into consideration.

- 11 לא תגנבו ולא־תכחשו ולא־תשקרו איש בעמיתו:
 12 ולא־תשבעו בשמי לשקר וחללת את־שם אלהיך אני יהוה:
- 13 לא־תעשק את־רעך ולא תגזל לא־תלין פעלת שכיר אתך עד־בקר:
 14 לא־תקלל חרש ולפני עור לא תתן מכשל ויראת מאלהיך אני יהוה:
- 15 לא־תעשו עול במשפט לא־תשא פני־דל ולא תהדר פני גדול בצדק תשפט עמיתך:
 16 לא־תלך רכיל בעמיד לא תעמד על־דם רעך אני יהוה:
- 17 לא־תשנא את־אחיד בלבבך הוכח תוכיח את־עמיתך ולא־תשא עליו חטא:
 18 לא־תקם ולא־תטר את־בני עמך ואהבת לרעך כמוך אני יהוה:

While the distinction between religious-cultic versus ethical is not straightforward in Leviticus, some observations strongly suggest that 19:11-18 is a self-contained unit that is devoted to ethical issues.⁶⁷ As Crüsemann observes, all of vv.11-18 is governed by the shorter structural marker אני יהוה and can be neatly divided into four parts.⁶⁸ These specific,

66. Magonet, "Structure and Meaning," 166.

67. While vv.9-10 seems to concern an ethical issue, it is grouped with vv.2-8 as the longer formula אני יהוה אלהיכם indicates.

68. Crüsemann, *Torah*, 322–25. See, also: Magonet, "Structure and Meaning," 151–67.

negative commands (*imperfect verb* + לא) are strung together with four positive statements:

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| [i] vv.11-12 (5 clauses) | 4 <i>imperfect verbs</i> + לא
1 <i>imperfect without</i> לא [חללת complements v.12a]
אני יהוה |
| [ii] vv.13-14 (6 clauses) | 5 <i>imperfect verbs</i> + לא
1 <i>positive command</i> [יראת counters v.14a+b]
אני יהוה |
| [iii] vv.15-16 (6 clauses) | 5 <i>imperfect verbs</i> + לא
1 <i>positive command</i> [תוכיח counters v.17a]
אני יהוה |
| [iv] vv.17-18 (6 clauses) | 5 <i>imperfect verbs</i> + לא
1 <i>positive command</i> [אהבת sums up vv.17-18]
אני יהוה |

Furthermore, every command in this section pertains to the horizontal dimension of life, that is, how one ought to relate to and act vis-à-vis the neighbour.

The first unit (vv.11-12) succinctly states five things: one should not steal (גנב), deceive (כחש), lie (שקר), and swear falsely (שבוע...לשקר) and profane (חלל) the name of YHWH. Smith notes that גנב means “to take that which belongs to another without his consent or knowledge,” and it seems to be differentiated from גזל and עשק by the secrecy of its act in this context (see below).⁶⁹ Both כחש and שקר connote deception yet maintain different shades of meaning: “[I]n the former, you deny a *truth*; in the latter, you affirm a *lie*.”⁷⁰ תשבוע בשמי לשקר is similar to the third command (Exod 20:7) and/or the

69. James Smith, “גנב,” in *TWOT*. Allbee contends that v.11 refers to “lying for the purpose of misappropriating property and false business dealings such as the improper use of weights and measures.” Richard A. Allbee, “Asymmetrical Continuity of Love and Law Between the Old and New Testaments: Explicating the Implicit Side of a Hermeneutical Bridge, Leviticus 19.11-18,” *JSOT* 31 (2006): 153-54.

70. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1631; M. A. Klopfenstein, “כחש” in *TLOT*; Dale Patrick, *Old*

ninth command (Exod 20:16) of the Decalogue and is followed by the resultative clause, “*thereby profane* the name of YHWH.” This chain of prohibitions in vv.11-12 demands complete honesty in dealing with the neighbour. The order of the prohibitions may be hinting at their causal connexion: if people steal (גנב), they are likely to deny the act (כחש), affirm a lie (שקר), and then in their defense, they may impel themselves to swear falsely (שבע בשמי לשקר) and as a result profane the name of YHWH.⁷¹

The second unit (vv.13-14) proscribes exploitation and oppression of the vulnerable. גול (‘rob’) connotes a violent seizing. עשק (‘oppress’) is usually used in reference to “acts of abuse of power or authority, burdening, trampling and crushing of those lower in station.”⁷² Thus, whereas גנב is a furtive act, גול and עשק are open, defiant acts. The following prohibition of withholding the wages (לין פעלה) of the hired labourer describes the latter type of oppression.⁷³ V.14 underlines that oppression is oppression regardless of whether it is recognised by the victim as such (i.e., the deaf cannot hear insults nor can the blind see the obstacles placed before them). The fear of YHWH should cause one to refrain from these acts. Here, אני יהוה perhaps takes on a heightened meaning: even if the victim is unaware of the act of oppression or the identity of the offender, God is.

The third unit (vv.15-16) seems to assume a legal or forensic setting. לא־תשא פני־דל ולא תהדר פני גדול calls for total equity in judgement, forbidding

Testament Law (Atlanta: JKP, 1985), 164.

71. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1632-33; Allbee, “Asymmetrical Continuity,” 155.

72. Ibid., 157; Ronald Allen, “עשק” in *TWOT*.

73. The withholding of the hirelings’ wage “puts the interest of the employer unfairly over against the welfare of the employee. It is commonly speculated that the employer did so in order to insure the employee’s return the next day or to simplify his finances. Whatever the reasons, the poor day laborers needed their pay every day to buy life’s essentials.” Allbee, “Asymmetrical Continuity,” 158.

one from honouring the rich/ strong or even favouring the poor/ weak (lit. 'lift the faces of the poor'). Justice (צדק) is to be served at all times. The next phrase (הלך רכיל) could be understood as "to deal basely with [the neighbour]" (LXX, NJPS) in court (assuming that v.16 still assumes a legal context). This reading is possible in the light of Jer 6:28 and Ezek 22:9 where רכיל is paralleled with corruption and betrayal. However, as most scholars maintain, רכיל is probably derived from רכל ('trader, merchant'; Ezek 27:15; Song 3:6),⁷⁴ and the combination of רכיל + הלך (Jer 6:28; 9:3; Prov 11:13; 20:19) consistently yields the sense of "go about to and fro gossiping and slandering (like a merchant)."⁷⁵ לא-תלך רכיל then interdicts making false claims against or gossiping about the neighbour. Given the probable juridical context of vv.15-16, the prohibition may refer specifically to the type of gossip and defamation that cause the neighbour to be brought to court.⁷⁶

The precise meaning of the next clause לא-תעמד על-ידם רעך (lit. 'you shall not stand over/upon the blood of your neighbour') is uncertain largely due to the ambiguity of the phrase עמד על. Three proposals have been put forward: [i] to stand idle when one's fellow is in danger (i.e., neglect to testify the truth on behalf of the neighbour in court),⁷⁷ [ii] rise against to kill or destroy the neighbour (through legal prosecution or extralegal retribution),⁷⁸ and [iii] profit or secure one's existence by the blood of the neighbour.⁷⁹ These three

74. רכיל, which may possibly be connected to רגל as well, occurs only six times in the HB (Lev 19:16; Jer 6:28; 9:3; Ezek 22:9; Prov 11:13; 20:19). William White, "רכיל," in TWOT; see also: R. H. O'Connell, "רכיל," NIDOTTE III:1114-1115.

75. Levine, *Leviticus*, 129; Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1645.

76. Allbee, "Asymmetrical Continuity," 160; Wenham, *Leviticus*, 268.

77. *Sifra Qedoshim* 4:8; *Targum Yerushalmi*; cf. Rashi; Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1645.

78. *Targum Onkelos*; cf. Ibn Ezra; Gerstenberger: "go after the blood"; Hartley: "jeopardize"; Kiuchi: "seek to destroy." Gerstenberger, *Leviticus*, 270; Hartley, *Leviticus*, 317; Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 352; Allbee, "Asymmetrical Continuity," 160-61.

79. Ehrlich compares this phrase to Ezek 33:26 (עמדתם על-חרבכם) and Gen 27:40 (ועל-חרבך)

suggestions are clearly related, and there seems to be no reason why one should pick one over the others—though, as Kiuchi observes, the parallel expressions found in Esth 8:11 and 9:16 slightly tip the scale towards the second option. In view of the structure of v.15 where the interdiction of עול in court (v.15a) is complemented by two related prohibitions (v.15b and v.15c), it seems best to take the clauses of v.16a and v.16b as complementing each other in a similar way. V.16a thus states a prohibition, and v.16b extends the argument. Slander may cause one's neighbour to be misjudged in court, perhaps even declared to be punishable by death. Not only is one prohibited from attacking or taking advantage of the neighbour through slander in the first place, but the slanderer (and others in court) is also not to remain silent—that is, stand idle in court—if such a situation should arise. If anyone is aware of the innocence of the slandered, then s/he should not remain silent but rather testify the truth, even if this means foregoing the potential gain that may have come with the condemnation of the slandered.⁸⁰

The last unit (vv.17-18) concludes this ethical section. Gerstenberger calls vv.17-18 “the crowning conclusion to everything that has been said about the welfare of one's fellow human beings within the community.”⁸¹ These verses consist of two sets of prohibitions, two remedies, and two rationales. Each negative command is immediately countered by a positive command in the classic formula: *not this, but that*. These are then supplemented by rationale clauses that effectively generate a double

תחיה) and suggests “sichere deine Existenz nicht durch den Tod deines Nächsten.” Arnold Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, II:64-65. This reading is adopted by Levine, *Leviticus*, 129.

80. Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1645. Just judgement is a common theme in the HB: e.g., Exod 23:1-3; 6-8; Deut 16:19-29; 19:15-21; 27:25; Ps 72:2; Prov 16:13. Wenham, *Leviticus*, 268.

81. Gerstenberger, *Leviticus*, 270.

prohibition–remedy–rationale structure as below:

v.17	לֹא־תִשְׁנָא אֶת־אֶחִיךָ בִּלְבָבְךָ הוֹכַח תּוֹכִיחַ אֶת־עַמִּיתְךָ וּלֹא־תִשָּׂא עָלָיו חֶטֶא	Prohibition Remedy Rationale
v.18	לֹא־תִקַּם וּלֹא־תִטַּר אֶת־בְּנֵי עַמְךָ וְאָהַבְתָּ לְרֹעֶךָ כְּמוֹךָ אֲנִי יְהוָה	Prohibition Remedy Rationale

Vv.17-18 is structurally bound together, and these verses immediately explicate each other. The issue of v.17a is to be remedied not only by v.17b but also by the corresponding v.18b. Likewise, the issue of v.18a is to be remedied by v.18b as well as by v.17b.⁸²

Most interpreters continue to interpret vv.17-18 within the judicial context. V.17 opens this unit with “you shall not שִׁנְא (*‘hate’*) your brother בִּלְבָבְךָ (*‘in your heart’*).” This clause places a particular stress on one’s inner disposition. לֵב (cf. לֵב) is a very common word in the HB (לֵב x601; לֵב x252) and is often imbued with various emotions, such as, vitality (Gen 18:5; Judg 19:5), desire (Job 31:9; Prov 6:25), pain (Isa 1:5; Jer 4:1), joy (Exod 4:14; Ps 4:8), and intellectual functions, such as, perception (Exod 7:23; 1 Sam 21:13), memory (Deut 4:9; Isa 65:17), insight (Deut 8:5; Prov 2:2), critical/juristic judgment (Judg 5:15; 1 Kgs 3:9), and will/deliberation (2 Sam 7:3; Isa 10:7).⁸³ It can also be used to refer to all dimensions of human existence.⁸⁴ V.17 does

82. Allbee, “Asymmetrical Continuity,” 161-65; Magonet, “Structure and Meaning,” 159.

83. לֵב probably signified the bodily organ in its original usage, but it came to take on a metaphorical meaning later. F. Stolz, “לֵב,” *TLOT* II:638-42. That לֵב can refer to the faculties of emotions and also of thought is clear, but just how the Hebraic thought separated these two is difficult to surmise. Hartley, *Leviticus*, 316; Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1646.

84. Bowling observes that לֵב is “the richest biblical term for the totality of man’s inner or immaterial nature ... it is the most frequently used term for man’s immaterial personality

not seem to be concerned with the philosophical distinction between the emotional and the intellectual aspects of the individual; rather, the employment of לב is meant to point to the totality of one's inner disposition: festering hatred is corrosive and has repercussions for both the thought and the feeling of that person. It will predispose him/her to seek to harm the neighbour.⁸⁵

This negative exhortation is countered by the positive admonition to rebuke openly (הוֹכַח תּוֹכִיָּה) one's brother.⁸⁶ While יָכַח can mean to instruct or correct in nonlegal settings (usually appearing in conjunction with יָסַר/מוֹסֵר; cf. Job 5:17; Ps 6:2; Prov 9:7; Jer 2:19) in the HB, it is most often found in forensic contexts with the meaning of "establish what is right in court" (e.g., Job 13:3; Isa 29:21; Amos 5:10).⁸⁷ In the light of Lev 19:15, which situates the whole of vv.15-18 in a legal setting, and the widely attested forensic usage of יָכַח, most commentators rightly interpret v.17 as dealing with a matter in court.⁸⁸

In his illuminating study, James Kugel interprets Lev 19:17, specifically the connexion between הוֹכַח תּוֹכִיָּה בְּלִבְךָ, שְׂנֵא בְּלִבְךָ and חָטָא, vis-à-vis Wisdom literature and some Jewish texts from the Second Temple period. Kugel attempts to locate Lev 19:17 within "the whole world of Israelite

functions as well as the most inclusive term for them since, in the Bible, virtually every immaterial function of man is attributed to the 'heart'." A. Bowling, "לֵב," in TWOT.

85. Hartely, *Leviticus*, 316.

86. Callahan argues that the infinitive absolute here highlights deontic imperative modality, which expresses a positive command in close proximity to negative commands. Scott N. Callahan, *Modality and the Biblical Hebrew Infinitive Absolute*, AKM 71 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010), 145-46. See also: Takamitsu Muraoka, *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985), 83-92.

87. H.-J. Fabry, "יָכַח ykh," TDOT VI:68-69.

88. However, not all are persuaded. Madl, for instance, asserts, "The admonition [of vv.17-18] addresses intimate personal relations rather than the forensic realm...." H. Madl, "נָטַר nāṭar," TDOT IX:405.

wisdom” and turns to Proverbs where the theme of reproach frequently appears.⁸⁹ Based on passages like Prov 10:18, which associates שנוא with deceit and connects “hatred in the heart” (i.e., concealed hatred) with slander, and Prov 26:24-25, which warns about an enemy who speaks graciously while dissembling his true feeling, Kugel suggests:

The idea of hating ‘your brother in your heart’ in Lev 19:17 seems to refer to hatred that is immediately internalized, that is, kept ‘in the heart’ while the hater’s external attitude shows nothing of what is inside ... for the not telling that is involved in hating another person yet dissembling one’s hatred in front of him is pointedly contrasted here to the act of slander, that is, telling others about the object of one’s hatred behind his back.⁹⁰

Although the juxtaposition of hate and rebuke probably seem counter-intuitive to the reader for whom love and hate chiefly signify attitudinal quality or emotional state, this contrast is significant in making sense of the logic of the love command.⁹¹ In Leviticus’ conceptual world, the prime remedy for festering hatred, which eventually precipitates slander, is reproof. If anyone has a complaint against a fellow Israelite, s/he ought to “bring it out to the open.” Gerstenberger opines, “In its juxtaposition of repressed hatred and open discourse, this text is thus referring to the kind of

89. James Kugel, “On Hidden Hatred and Open Reproach: Early Exegesis of Leviticus 19:17,” *HTR* 80 (1987): 43-61. Cf. Prov 3:12; 27:5-6; 28:23.

90. *Ibid.*, 46; also, Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1646.

91. יכח can signify, for instance, king’s judicial function (Isa 11:3; Hab 1:12) or an inquiry for deity’s adjudication in the temple (Isa 2:4; Mic 4:3). From this language of lawsuit “to call/summon” (and perhaps by the influence of the Sapiential tradition as well), יכח seems to have developed meaning to “reprove” or “reproach” (i.e., Job 13:17-22; 19:5; Prov 3:12; 9:8; 19:25; 28:23; Ps 50:7; 16:21). BDB: יכח; Fabry, “יכח,” VI:65-69; Hartley, *Leviticus*, 316-7; Gerstenberger, *Leviticus*, 271; Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1647-48.

argumentation that ought to take place within the congregation.”⁹² Reading Lev 19:11-18 against this wisdom theme illuminates this point.⁹³

The next clause **וְלֹא-חֲשָׂא עָלֶיךָ חֶטֶא** (v.17c) is connected to v.17b, as marked by the ו, and provides the rationale for the preceding two clauses: “so that you will not bear sin on account of/which is upon him.” Even though the combination of **חֲשָׂא** plus a sin word appears elsewhere in Leviticus (20:20; 22:9; 24:15; cf. Num 18:32), the precise meaning of this phrase remains equivocal.⁹⁴ Two renderings are usually proposed. On the one hand, “to bear sin because of him” could refer to the vengeful action taken by the offended. In other words, “if you (the offended) do not reprove, then you yourself are likely to take action against him (the offender), which may prove sinful.”⁹⁵ In this reading, the growing hatred prompts the offended to retaliate illegitimately against the offender. This in turn causes the initially offended now to become the offender who deserves punishment.⁹⁶ Proper reproof preempts this kind of **נֶקֶם** that is generated by hidden hatred. Kugel calls this the “moralistic/externalizing” reading:

The manner in which the reproach is administered is all-important: it must serve to externalize the offended party’s hurt (for this is how hidden hatred is to be overcome), yet not in so forthright or aggressive a

92. Absalom’s hatred towards Amnon (2 Sam 13:22, 28-29) is also illustrative of this point that hidden hatred (eventually) oozes out. Gerstenberger, *Leviticus*, 271.

93. Kugel, “On Hidden Hatred,” 47.

94. Hartley, *Leviticus*, 316-7. Milgrom observes that **חֲשָׂא עָלֶיךָ חֶטֶא** usually connotes “to forgive” outside of P (Gen 18:24; Exod 23:21; Num 14:18-19; Josh 24:19; 1 Sam 25:28), but this expression always denotes “bears sin/punishment” in P. He also notes that similar usage of this phrase is found in Ezekiel (4:4-6; 14:10; 18:19; 44:10, 12), which depends heavily on P/H, and Isa 53:12 where the writer was familiar with P’s idiom. Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1649; BDB: **חֲשָׂא** (cf. 2b, 3c).

95. Hartley, *Leviticus*, 317; Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1649-50.

96. Hartley, *Leviticus*, 317.

fashion as to constitute an offense in itself or so as to cause the reproached party only to become obdurate.⁹⁷

On the other hand, the sin could refer to the failure of the offended to rebuke the offender; that is, the sin of silence.⁹⁸ If יכח was already codified as a judicial procedure (as seen in the DSS; see Ch.4), neglecting one's duty of reproof caused the offended to be guilty. Kugel calls this the "judicial" reading. The Israelites were held responsible to hold each other accountable that the negligence of this duty constituted a sin.⁹⁹ The former seems preferable, since the latter anachronistically depends on later Jewish sources to make sense of Leviticus. Yet, whichever scenario is in view, reproof plays an indispensable role in meeting the demands of the love command, as reproof dispels or remedies hatred.¹⁰⁰

The pair of prohibitions in v.18 takes בני עמך as its object. נקם ('*avenge, take vengeance*') essentially pertains to an outward deed while נטר ('*hold a grudge*') pertains to thought. This pair concretely elaborates what is meant by שנא.¹⁰¹ As for the former, נקם occurs seventy-nine times in the HB with God as its explicit or implied subject (ca. 85% of the time). Counterintuitive as it may be, נקם is, first and foremost, God's prerogative. It tends to have a

97. Kugel, "On Hidden Hatred," 56-57. Cf. Prov; Sir 20:2; 19:13-17.

98. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1649-50; Hartley, *Leviticus*, 317; Kugel, "On Hidden Hatred," 56-57.

99. Kugel points out a third possibility. He identifies another type of moral interpretation in *T. Gad* 4:1-3 and 6:1-5 where ולא-תשא עליו חטא is interpreted as a reference neither to illegitimate vengeance nor conniving silence but to the severity of reproach. In this reading, the offended is warned not to reprove the offender too severely. Scathing reproach may cause the offender to feel cornered and swear rashly in defence. The reproacher would then be held responsible for causing the offender to sin even more. *Ibid.*, 49-52.

100. Berend Gemser, "The Importance of the Motive Clauses," in *Congress Volume: Copenhagen 1953*, ed. G. W. Anderson et al., VTSup 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1953), 50-66.

101. The phrase לא-תקם is missing in the Syriac version, probably due to haplography. LXX adds σου ἡ χεὶρ ('*your hand*') after תקם probably for greater specification.

theologically positive connotation in the HB, as its association with ideas like lawfulness, justice, and salvation readily attests.¹⁰² נקם can also have a negative dimension when applied to human agencies.¹⁰³ Here in v.18, this negative sense is clearly intended, and נקם refers to an illegitimate act of vengeance, that is, extralegal retribution.¹⁰⁴ As Peels notes, “The word group *nqm* is used as an utterance of an evil, resentful disposition in Lev 19:18: revengefulness is in conflict with a holy life in covenantal communion and as such is forbidden.”¹⁰⁵ As for the latter, נטר only occurs nine times in the HB and at its most basic level simply means to “keep” or “maintain.”¹⁰⁶ Except for Lev 19:18, God is always the subject of נטר (Jer 3:5, 12; Nah 1:2; Ps 103:9). Here in Lev 19:18, the pairing of נטר with נקם and its close association with שונא suggest an emotionally charged meaning of נטר as “to store up anger” or “to hold a grudge.”¹⁰⁷ Thus the logic of the couplet of vv.17-18 runs: instead

102. H. Peels, “נקם” *NIDOTTE* III:154. Lipiński observes that the obligation to take vengeance is not only encouraged by the entire OT legislation (i.e., Exod 21:12; Lev 24:17; Deut 19:11ff.), but it is actually required. Gen 9:6, for instance, requires the blood of the person who shed human blood to be shed. E. Lipiński, “נקם *nāqam*” *TDOT* X:3-6; Peels, “נקם,” III:155. Although whatever falls short in human court will be exacted by God himself in principle, God at times assigns the task to human agencies (e.g., a judge, king, court; Num 31:2-3; cf. Josh 10:13; 1 Sam 14:24). Even Israel is not exempt from God’s נקם, and God of the Covenant can turn against Israel as well (Lev 26:15). A truly righteous person who has been taken advantage of will commit his/her loss to YHWH’s נקם, since God in his own time will avenge (Deut 32:35; Ps 94:1; 1 Sam 24:12). Hartley, *Leviticus*, 317; Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1652.

103. Peels, “נקם,” III:154.

104. BDB: נקם.

105. Peels, “נקם,” III:156.

106. Of nine of its occurrences, six are verbal (Dan 7:28 contains its Aramaic equivalent). Four times in Songs of Songs (1:6 [x2]; 8:11, 12), נטר is metaphorically used as the one who protects a vineyard and its fruits. In poetic texts, נטר seems to be a technical term as it is paralleled by terms like שמר (‘guard [one’s anger]’; Jer 3:5, 12b) and ריב (‘contend, accuse’; Ps 103:9). K. Schoville, “נטר,” *NIDOTTE* III:98.

107. Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1651. Milgrom argues that these common translations do not capture the “intensity of the anger and rage embedded in the term *nāṭar*, which has to match that of *nāqam* ‘avenge, take revenge’.” He also notes that Westbrook takes נטר as the cognate of Akkadian *nadaru* (‘be angry, rage’) and suggests that the command is not to

of allowing ill feelings to fester, one ought to “confront his kinsman and admonish him directly, in this way avoiding grudges and vengeance that breed hatred.”¹⁰⁸

Then the levitical love command comes into view: **אהבת לרעך כמוך**. This positive command to love carefully complements the preceding pair of prohibitions: rather than **נקם** and **נטר**, one ought to **אהב**. **אהב** apparently functions as an immediate antithesis for **נקם** and **נטר**, and it is given a concrete meaning here. However, **אהב** also functions more remotely as an antithesis of another key idea: **שנא**. The collocation of **אהב-שנא** (*‘do not hate... but rather love’*), which is standard in the HB (see below), binds the whole of vv.17-18 as an inseparable unit.¹⁰⁹ This polar disposition effectively encapsulates the essence of the ethical commands of vv.11-18. Jenni observes that the love command “eclipses external legislative regulations by reshaping ... an older series of negative injunctions concerning Israelite behavior in juridical life into positive commandments....”¹¹⁰ Open reproof is meant not only to dispel hatred but even to engender love.¹¹¹

suppress the anger but to release it in the form of “savage slaughter performed by wild beasts, animals and robbers” (CAD 11:1.59-60). Ibid.

108. Levine, *Leviticus*, 129.

109. Syntactically, the object of **אהב** is usually in the accusative (**את** or the like), but the object is preceded by **ל** here. The simplest explanation for this aberration is to identify the **ל** as a form of Aramaism where **ל** functions as a direct object marker (cf. Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten*, 4-5). Others note that the **ל** here expresses a reflexive relationship, which is a reading that probably results from the assumption that **כמוך** is adverbial. *IBHS*, 388 [23.4 c]. But Malamat proposes, based on the parallelism between **אהב** + **ל** and **עזר** in 2 Chr 19:2 (cf. 1 Kgs 5:15), that **אהב** + **ל** means, “be of use to, be beneficial to, assist.” Abraham Malamat, “‘You Shall Love Your Neighbor as Yourself’: A Case of Misinterpretation?,” in *Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Erhard Blum et al. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), 111-15. Cf. D. Hoffmann, *Das Buch Leviticus: Halbband. Lev. XVIII-Ende* (Berlin: M. Poppelauer, 1906), 42-44; Crüsemann, *Torah*, 324; Hartley, *Leviticus*, 318; Levine, *Leviticus*, 130.

110. E. Jenni, “**אהב** ‘hb to love,” *TLOT* I:50.

111. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1648; Fabry, “**יכח**,” VI:68-69.

Yet, what does it mean to love one's neighbour כַּמּוֹד? Each word of this key phrase will be considered now, though the analysis of כַּמּוֹד will be postponed until 19:33-34 has been considered.

2.3.2.1 אָהַב

In the HB the root אָהַב occurs 251 times.¹¹² Of these occurrences, the verbal form occurs 140 times with an exceedingly broad semantic range.¹¹³ Its regular antonym is שָׂנֵא, as observed in Lev 19, and they together appear more than thirty times.¹¹⁴ אָהַב most commonly refers to the affection between various figures,¹¹⁵ and the parallel expressions and ideas in Hebrew imply “the passionate desire to be intimately united with a person (in all of life's relationships, not only inwardly but also outwardly) with whom one feels himself united in his affections (Gen. 2:23f).”¹¹⁶

אָהַב can also be applied to YHWH, typically as the motivation for his deeds. In such cases, אָהַב often underlines his covenantal love with Israel (Jer

112. Jenni, “אָהַב,” I:45-54. The highest concentration of the verb is found in Ps (x41), Prov (x32), Deut (x23), Hos (x19), Song (x18), and Gen (x15). The root אָהַב only occurs twice in Leviticus (19:18, 19:34).

113. Qal active participle (x36; usually meaning “friend”), niph'al participle (x1), piel participle (x16; “paramour”), and other substantival forms (x54). It is used x32 to denote God's love for Jerusalem (x2), righteousness or judgment (x7), Israel or particular individual (x23), and x22 as a reference to human love for God: God's name/law/precepts (x19), and Jerusalem (x2 [or x3 if Lam 1:2 is also included]). See, P. Els, “אָהַב,” *NIDOTTE* I:278; G. Wallis, “אָהַב *’āhabh*,” *TDOT* I:102; Clines, “אָהַב,” *DCH* I:137-42.

114. Ibid., 102.

115. For example, [a] members of the opposite sex (Gen 24:67; Judg 14:16; 1 Sam 1:5; 2 Sam 1:26), [b] conjugal intercourse itself (Hos 3:1), [c] intimate bond between father/son (Gen 22:2; 37:3; Prov 13:24), [d] mother/child (Gen 25:28) or daughter-in-law/mother-in-law (Ruth 4:15), [e] friendly relationships (Saul/David - 2 Sam 16:21; teacher/disciple - Prov 9:8), [f] servant/master (Exod 21:5), and [g] soldiers/military leader (1 Sam 18:16). Ibid., 104.

116. “Behind this yearning to be near someone physically lie internal emotions....” Ibid., 102-3. Also: Crüsemann, *Torah*, 324-25.

31:3; cf. Deut 7:8; 10:15), as the influential work of Moran shows.¹¹⁷ Just as YHWH's love is made known to Israel through his action, so is Israel's love for YHWH measured by her action. God loves Israel by subduing its enemies (Deut 7:8), and in return God is loved by Israel's observance of his commandments (Deut 11:1; cf. 5:10; 7:5ff.).¹¹⁸ Since one's motivation or inner feeling is ultimately unmeasurable from human perspective, one's inside (viz., heart) is judged by one's outward action. In short, love is seen in concrete action.

By the same token, hatred is measured by its outward manifestations. Those who set their heart on something wicked or are filled with hate are naturally motivated to "do wickedness" (cf. Isa 1:23ff.). The fundamental assumption is that their true, attitudinal and emotional disposition will be expressed eventually in outward and visible action. Illustrative in this regard is Isa 56:6 where people's love for YHWH is spoken of interchangeably with their activity.¹¹⁹

This principle also holds true in the horizontal-relational dimension of אהב, that is, interpersonal love: Jonathan's for David (1 Sam 18:1-4; 20:17ff.), Jacob's for Rachel (Gen 29:18, 30), Israel's for Joseph (37:3ff.), a slave's for his master (Exod 21:5; cf. Deut 15:16), etc.¹²⁰ Suffice it to say, אהב and its derivatives in the HB have:

117. Moran avers, "Love in Deuteronomy is a love that can be commanded. It is also a love intimately related to fear and reverence. Above all, it is a love which must be expressed in loyalty, in service, and in unqualified obedience to the demands of the Law.... It is, in brief, a love defined by and pledged in the covenant—a covenantal love." William L. Moran, "Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy," *CBQ* 25 (1963): 78.

118. Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1653.

119. Jer 2:2 also speaks of "[t]he Israel that loves Yahweh follows him in obedience." Wallis, "אהב," I:106.

120. *Ibid.*, 105-6.

...a strikingly pragmatic character. Not only does love presuppose a concrete inner disposition which is based on experiences and events, but it includes a conscious act in behalf of the person who is loved or the thing that is preferred. In this sense love ultimately has a sociological (indeed, a socio-ethical) basis.... It is precisely in such deeds of love that the command to love can be seen in a proper perspective, viz., the attitude of love is itself made the norm. Therefore, love is not merely a demand which a humanitarian spirit makes on a man, but it is rooted in the divine command to love.¹²¹

Turning our focus back to Lev 19:17-18, **אהב** should not be thought of in a romantic or charitable fashion. It is neither wishful nor impractical. Its occurrence “in a linguistic context of juridically determined interhuman conduct” shows that **אהב** denotes a certain behavioural pattern, specifically one that operates to rectify injustice in a forensic setting.¹²² In Gerstenberger’s words, “Against the background of familial solidarity, it [i.e., **אהב**] refers to the shared connection and mutual responsibility of human beings living in a community of faith.”¹²³ Kaufmann also articulates, “Both compassion and love are embodied in the social legislation.... What is meant by this [i.e., Lev 19:18] is not a mere state of mind, but its actualization in deeds of generosity and kindness.”¹²⁴ Accordingly, to love one’s fellow is to reprove him/her openly; yet, conversely, the act of reproof is only admissible when it is motivated by love—not by animosity, or by jealousy, or lust for power.¹²⁵ While the practical (or practicable) aspect of **אהב** is certainly foregrounded

121. Ibid.

122. Els, “**אהב**,” I:290.

123. Gerstenberger, *Leviticus*, 272.

124. Kaufmann, *The Religion*, 320.

125. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1648.

here (and in v.34), the motivational and affective aspect of אהב also remains salient.

One additional observation should be brought to bear at this point. In her illuminating study, Susan Ackerman insightfully points out a very “one-sided” usage of אהבה/אהב in the HB: when אהב is used to denote attraction or affection to the opposite sex, it refers almost exclusively to “the man’s love for the woman,” and when אהב is employed in connexion with the love between a parent and a child, “no child in the narrative tradition—or, indeed, anywhere in the Bible—is described as loving his or her parents.”¹²⁶ As Ackerman convincingly shows, אהב in the HB is typically assigned to “the hierarchically superior party in the relationship.”¹²⁷ In other words, אהב in the HB is not reciprocal but rather is shown by the higher status to the lower status. This observation certainly holds true for Lev 19, though the hierarchy in view here is neither “man-woman” nor “parent-child” but “strong-weak.” In his recent article, Schenker suggests that the levitical love command should be equated with the prohibition of deceitful acts and exploitation of the vulnerable.¹²⁸ While Schenker’s contention about the notional basis of the

126. Susan Ackerman, “The Personal is Political: Covenantal and Affectionate Love (‘āhēb, ‘ahābā) in the Hebrew Bible,” VT 52 (2002): 440-41. She rejects [i] the “appeal to the Bible’s preferred perspectival stances,” [ii] the assumption that women/children did not reciprocate love, and [iii] the construal that אהב is “an initiating action that determines or sets the stage for what is to follow” as adequate explanations for this one-sided usage of אהב in the HB. Ibid., 441-45. See, also: Irmtraud Fischer, “Über ‘die Liebe’ in hierarchischen Gesellschaftsformen,” in *Liebe, Macht und Religion: Interdisziplinäre Studien zu Grunddimensionen menschlicher Existenz: Gedenkschrift für Helmut Merklein*, ed. Marlis Gielen (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2003), 63-81.

127. Ackerman, “Personal is Political,” 447. Deut 6:5 (cf. 7:9; 10:12; 11:1, 13, 22, etc.) where Israel is commanded to love God may seem to undermine Ackerman’s argument. However, her argument pertains to *interpersonal* love. Once the distinction between divine-human and human-human love is maintained, her contention remains intact.

128. Schenker argues that the entire logic of Lev 19:11-18 is grounded in the impossibility of self-harm or self-deceit, and the prohibition only makes sense if one takes “die naturgegebene Unmöglichkeit von Arglist und Faustrecht gegen sich selbst als Richtschnur

love command is open to discussion, the observation that the love command has a fairly restricted scope and specific logic in Leviticus is certainly correct. Lev 19:11-18 is not a series of general and vague exhortations that is aimed at everyone in Israel, but these commands are specifically aimed at the party that is hierarchically superior. For instance, Lev 19:13-14 and vv.33-34 prohibit the addressees from exploiting and oppressing their רֵעַ and the גֵר among them (more on these below). The implicit assumption in these verses, of course, is that the addressees *have the power* to commit these oppressive acts. The addressees are assumed to be at least the equal, if not the more powerful or the socially superior, party in the context. The very absence of the commands that specifically address the poor and needy (e.g., love those who provide for you; do not grumble against your master; thank those who help you in your need) in this section is also telling.¹²⁹ The command assumes a hierarchical relationship between the one who ought to love and the one who is loved. Accordingly, while the love command is in some measure addressed to everyone in Israel, the target addressees are those with power

für das Verhältnis zum Mitmenschen." Adrian Schenker, "Das Gebot der Nächstenliebe in seinem Kontext (Lev 19,17–18): lieben ohne Falschheit," ZAW 124 (2012): 247. According to Schenker, the logic of the prohibition thus runs: because one *cannot* defraud or exploit oneself, to love others "as yourself" means one *must not* defraud or exploit the neighbour / alien. Schenker stresses the negative aspect of the love command much in line with the Golden Rule ("wie du dich selber nicht hintergehen und dich nicht selbst unterdrücken kannst, genauso darfst du es auch gegenüber andern nicht *wollen*"), although he qualifies that the purpose of the love command goes beyond that of the Golden Rule. Lev 19:18 "vor allem das richtige Verhältnis zum Mitmenschen erklären will: Dein Verhältnis zu dir selbst ist ohne Verstellung und ohne Vergewaltigung." Ibid., 247-48. Schenker's suggestion is a mere extension of Mathys's earlier argument. Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten*, 19.

129. The underlying assumption is probably that those who are on the fringes of the society do not have the power or the resource to oppress the rich and the powerful in the first place, and the poor and the inferior would be inclined to act favourably towards those who would show them grace and justice.

However, the commands for the socially weaker, e.g., the slaves, to obey their superior, e.g., masters, are found in the NT (Eph 6:4; Col 3:22; Rom 13:1-7).

to oppress and exploit others. The objects of love (רַע and the גֵּר) are depicted as those who are socially and economically inferior (hence obviously *not like you*) but should be considered as one's equal and treated with justice and care because they are in fact *someone like you* before YHWH (see below). Ackerman's insight on the hierarchically-laden connotation of אָהַב aptly underlines this dimension of the love command.

2.3.2.2 רַע

But who is רַע־ךָ ('*your neighbour*') in the context? In the HB, רַע could indicate various relationships: a close friend (Job 2:11), a mere acquaintance (Job 20:10; Exod 21:14), an ally (1 Sam 30:26), a friend of the king (1 Kgs 4:5), a neighbour (Prov 25:17) and so forth, but in all these cases the term refers to a fellow Israelite.¹³⁰ In Lev 19:11-18, four interrelated terms are tightly strung together, which also confirms this. Wenham tabulates these terms as the following:¹³¹

vv.11-12		עִמִּיתךָ		
vv.13-14				רַע־ךָ
vv.15-16		עִמִּיתךָ	בְּנֵי עַמְּךָ	רַע־ךָ
vv.17-18	אֶחָיִךָ	עִמִּיתךָ	בְּנֵי עַמְּךָ	רַע־ךָ

עִמִּית occurs only twelve times in the HB, but eleven of these occurrences are found in Leviticus (the only other occurrence in Zech 13:7). The term עִמִּית is very closely associated with Leviticus—or H, since outside of H, it is only found twice in Lev 5:21. The precise meaning of עִמִּית is uncertain, but its

130. Clines, "רַע," DCH VII:509-13.

131. Wenham, *Leviticus*, 266-67; Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1654; Hartley, *Leviticus*, 317.

close connexion with רַע is telling.¹³² Likewise, the phrase בְּנֵי עַמְּךָ ('sons of your people') is fairly rare.¹³³ The precise connotation is not clear either, but most see no distinction between בְּנֵי עַמְּךָ and the extremely common word עַם.¹³⁴ The common term אָח could mean a male person born of the same parent or a relative, but it could also function as a synecdoche that refers to all the Israelites.¹³⁵ While the precise reference and semantic range of each term is debated, the deliberate employment of these related terms in a tightly knit unit stresses that the text has intra-Israelite relations in view.¹³⁶ It highlights that the object of אָהֵב must encompass *every member of the covenant community*, viz., the fellow Israelite, with an added emphasis on those who are weak and vulnerable.¹³⁷

However, others propose an even narrower scope for רַעֲךָ. In his study on Jewish circumcision and its relation to Jewish identity, Shaye Cohen argues that terms like "Israel" or "sons of Israel" in the HB only refer to Israelite men and exclude women.¹³⁸ Cohen makes some intriguing exegetical observations, as he marshals evidence of this line of interpretation in rabbinic literature. He observes that at the revelation of the Decalogue at Sinai (Exod

132. H.-J. Zobel, "עֲמִית 'āmīt," TDOT XI:194. Mathys thinks the meaning of עֲמִית in H is the equivalent of רַע in Deuteronomy. Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten*, 37.

133. The construction *suffix* + עַם + בֶּן occurs only twice in Lev (19:18; 20:17), four times in the Pentateuch (Gen 23:11; Num 22:5) and fourteen times altogether in the HB.

134. Thus, for example, Lipiński asserts, "The word 'am also has the same meaning 'ancestors' in Lev. 19:18aα, which regulates the taking of vengeance." Lipiński, "נָקָם," X:6; Joosten, *People and Land*, 83.

135. BDB: אָח, I. Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1647.

136. Ibid., 1654; Hartley, *Leviticus*, 317; Lipiński, "נָקָם," X:6; Zobel, "עֲמִית," XI:194.

137. Hartley, *Leviticus*, 318.

138. Shaye J. D. Cohen, *Why Aren't Jewish Women Circumcised? Gender and Covenant in Judaism* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005), 120-42. David Clines makes a similar point in connexion with the Decalogue. David Clines, "The Ten Commandments, Reading from Left to Right," in *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F.A. Sawyer*, ed. Jon Davies et al., JSOTSup 195 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995), 97-112.

19), YHWH addresses **הָעָם**, which could only refer to the men of Israel, as vv.14-15 makes plain.¹³⁹ Similarly, the covenant renewal at Moab in Deut 29:10-12 [MT: 29:9-11] clearly addresses the Israelite male. Cohen opines:

[In Deut 29:9-11,] You, the men of Israel, are accompanied by your leaders, who are *your tribal heads, your elders and your officials*, and by your retainers, your chattel, your dependents, who are *your children, your wives, even the stranger with your camp*. Wives are not *you*; they are *yours*—a big difference.¹⁴⁰ (italics Cohen's)

Cohen's argument could be extended to Lev 19. In support of his view is the very language of the chapter opening **בְּלִבְיֹדֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**, which specifies Israelite men as the primary addressees.¹⁴¹ The key issue is whether the women (and children for that matter) are assumed to be the implicit objects of the love command or they are excluded altogether.¹⁴² This question does not need to detain us here, but if one accepts Cohen's point, then the scope of the levitical love command is even more restricted than often assumed—for **רֵעִי** (and likewise the **גֵּר**) would only refer to male figures. Even if one rejects his contention, it is true that women and children are subsumed under the

139. Cohen, *Why Aren't Jewish Women*, 120.

140. Ibid., 138.

141. Joosten also thinks that "sons of Israel" only refers to men. Joosten, *People and Land*, 29-33. But Milgrom challenges this. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1409-14, 1471-72.

142. According to Cohen, women had secondary status in the HB and beyond, given the the androcentric perspective of the Torah and no less of rabbinic Judaism. He states, "Circumcision celebrates the birth of a male, marking him as a member of the covenant, as a member of his people, as his father's son, as a future citizen. Circumcision excludes women; by investing circumcision with covenantal value, both the Bible and the talmudic sages declare that Judaism, or at least Jewishness, is in the first instance synonymous with maleness.... Neither circumcised nor obligated to observe all the commandments, Jewish women are Israel yet not quite Israel." Cohen, *Why Aren't Jewish Women*, 135-37. Cohen thinks the rabbis instituted the matrilineal principle as systematic compensation for the women's secondary status. Ibid., 141-42.

men of Israel in Lev 19, and they are the objects of love *by extension*. Nevertheless, Clements proposes a more inclusive reading: if kinship provided “the very fabric with which the Israelite society was clothed,” then the deliberate use of “neighbour” over against “brothers and sisters” in Lev 19:18 is an attempt to “extend justice beyond the self-interest of the family group and to awaken moral awareness beyond its borders.”¹⁴³ Clements’s point is compelling, since it coheres with the openness of the law in extending the love of neighbour to the גר (see below). As such, while the *language* of Lev 19 may be indeed androcentric, the *intended scope* of the law’s application seems more inclusive than Cohen suggests.

To sum up, the stacking of these kinship words signals that vv.11-18 is not to be facilely read as a universalistic mandate, encompassing everyone in the world.¹⁴⁴ The fact that the text carefully specifies the גר (and only the גר!) as the object of love later in v.34 further corroborates the point that the levitical love command is not an all-encompassing, egalitarian command for everyone to love everyone. Rather, it is a pointed demand that mainly concerns intra-Israelite relations, primarily aimed at the socio-economically superior party who ought to look after those who have lower socio-economic status in the community. At the same time, Lev 19:18 seems to evidence a trajectory of qualified openness where the Israelites are called to extend their love and care beyond their kinship ties.

143. Clements, *Loving One’s Neighbour*, 21. Clements thinks Lev 19:18 “opens a window onto a very large panorama of moral and social interest.” Ibid., 19. He calls for “a proper awareness of the social context of ethics,” and, much like Mathys, sets Lev 19:18 in an urban setting after the influence of kingship had dwindled (exilic period?). Ibid., 16.

144. Noth also thinks the object of love is restricted to the “other members of the community.” Noth, *Leviticus*, 141-42.

2.3.3 The extended neighbourly love (19:33-34)

The levitical love command reappears in 19:33-34. Vv.33-34 repeats and develops vv.11-18 in the form of an appendix.¹⁴⁵

v.33	וכי־יגור אתך ¹⁴⁶ גר בארצכם לא תונו אתו	Prohibition
v.34	כאזרח מכם יהיה לכם הגר הגר אתכם	Remedy 1
	ואהבת לו כמוך	Remedy 2
	כי־גרים הייתם בארץ מצרים	Rationale 1
	אני יהוה אלהיכם	Rationale 2

The near-exact parallel structure of this second love command (+ אהבת - ל +) signals an unmistakable link to vv.17-18: the dative לו (v.34b; its antecedent being הגר) neatly corresponds to לרעך (v.18) and the sudden switch to second person singular (אהבת) from the preceding second person plural (v.34a; אתכם, לכם, מכם) confirms that the verse is at pains to connect v.34 to v.18.

Instead of the double *prohibition-remedy-rationale* structure of vv.17-18, vv.33-34 has a single prohibition, followed by two interrelated statements for remedy and rationale. Whereas the shorter structural marker is employed in v.18, the longer formula closes this section. V.33 employs the *temporal/circumstantial* כי ('when') rather than the conditional אם ('if'), which intimates that the presence of the גר is not a theoretical construct but an assumed reality.¹⁴⁷ The command not to oppress (ינה) the גר is found in Exod 22:20 as

145. Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 347.

146. The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Versions read אתכם instead of אתך—a reading which corresponds to the pronominal suffix of בארצכם. Changes in number frequently occur in legal corpora (i.e., Exod 22:21-22; Lev 23:22; 25:46, etc.). Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1705.

147. Joosten observes that this section is formulated and “addresses the Israelites in their capacity as land-owners.” Joosten, *People and Land*, 61.

well, but Leviticus adds a unique twist: the גר must be treated on a par with the אֲזִרָה.¹⁴⁸ Nihan observes:

V. 33-34 seem to combine the two laws of 19:13-14 and 17-18 from the perspective of the גר, the resident alien: he must not be 'oppressed' or 'exploited' (עָנָה Piel), because of his inferior social status (v.13, although there with עָשָׂק), but he must instead be loved 'as a native/citizen' (בְּאִזְרָה).¹⁴⁹

To treat the גר like a native-born is to love him כְּמוֹד. The גר who lives in their midst now emerges as the new object of אָהַב, while all other "kinds" of foreigners (i.e., תּוֹשָׁב, זָר, נִכְרִי) are excluded (more on this point below).¹⁵⁰

The command to love here is once again not platonic but practical. To love the גר is not merely to refrain from oppressing him (Exod 22:20; 23:9) but also to be active in providing support, safety, food and shelter (Exod 3:5, 15; Lev 19:10, cf. 23:22; Deut 14:28-29; 24:19), to include him in festival celebrations (Deut 16:11; 26:11), to grant him rest on the sabbath (Exod 20:10; 23:12) and so forth.¹⁵¹ This second love command is grounded not only in two ideas (Rationale 1 and 2 above), as commonly supposed, but in three notions: [i] the likeness (כְּמוֹד) of the גר to a fellow Israelite, [ii] the analogous

148. The term אֲזִרָה always appears in tandem with גר in Leviticus, or more specifically in H, as the גר-אֲזִרָה dyad (17:15; 18:26; 19:34; 24:16, 22). The fuller designation of אֲזִרָה is אֲזִרָה הָאָרֶץ ('the native of the land'; e.g., Exod 12:19, 48), a meaning which is echoed in the expression כָּל-הָאֲזִרָה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל (Lev 23:42). The etymology is unknown, but Levine suggests that it may have originally been a botanical term (viz., Ps 37:35) that took on a metaphorical meaning for someone whose lineage has "roots" in the land. Levine, *Leviticus*, 134.

149. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 464.

150. Els, "אָהַב," I:291.

151. Kaufmann comments, "All the laws that obligate men to stand by each other in the time of need, or which forbid exploiting poverty and distress, are based on this law of love." Kaufmann, *The Religion*, 320.

experience of Israel's suffering in Egypt (כי גרים הייתם בארץ מצרים)¹⁵² and [iii] the authority of YHWH (אני יהוה אלהיכם). Yet, once again, who is this גר in Leviticus, and why is he introduced here? Furthermore, what does it mean to love someone כמוך? I will now examine the other two key terms, גר and כמוך, before I draw some conclusions about the meaning of the love command.

2.3.3.1 גר

The appearance of the גר at this point raises several intriguing issues. I will first make some preliminary observations on the גר in the HB and then shift the focus onto the גר in Leviticus.

The verb גור (*gūr*) occurs 81 times in the HB,¹⁵³ and the most common meaning is "to dwell *with* or *in the midst of* a certain community" (Exod 12:48; Lev 19:33).¹⁵⁴ The verb גור is often paralleled and shares common elements with ישב ('*dwell*') and שכן ('*settle down*'), both in narrative (e.g., Gen 20:1) and

152. This rationale is used elsewhere to muster support for the גר (e.g., Exod 22:20; 23:9; Deut 10:19; 23:8). For instance, Deut 10:17-19, which describes the גר as poor and needy along side the יתום and the אלמנה, commands the love for the גר. Here, the formula slightly differs from Lev 19:34 (i.e., גר ואהבתם את הגר lacks the qualifier כמוך and את replaces לו), but the command to love is grounded in the analogous experience/suffering of Israel again. The rule of equality before the Law for the alien and the native-born alike is grounded in Israel as הגרים in the land of Egypt. Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1707. Jackson argues that the Pentateuch presents Israel as participating in the universal vision via its particularity: "Israel's particular experience is to be taken as a paradigm for its own treatment of the Other." Jackson, "Literary Presentation," 197.

153. This statistic naturally excludes its homonyms (II גור '*to attack*'; III גור '*to be afraid*'). Clines, "גור," DCH II:335-36.

154. In legal texts, the masculine singular form גר occurs 60 times (Exod 12:19, 48-49; 20:10; 22:20; 23:9, 12; Lev 16:29; 17:8, 10, 12-13, 15; 18:26; 19:10, 33; 20:2; 22:18; 23:22; 24:16, 22; 25:35, 47; Num 9:14; 15:14-16, 26, 29-30; 19:10; 35:15; Deut 1:16; 5:14; 10:19; 14:21, 29; 16:11, 14; 23:8; 24:14, 17, 19-21; 26:11-13; 27:19; 29:10; 31:12; Josh 8:33, 35; 20:9); in non-legal texts, it occurs 21 times (Gen 15:13; 23:4; Exod 2:22; 18:3; Deut 10:18; 28:43; 2 Sam 1:13; Isa 14:1; Jer 7:6, 14:8; 22:3; Ezek 14:7; 22:7, 29; 47:23; Zech 7:10; Mal 3:5; Ps 39:13; 94:6; 119:19; Job 31:32). José E Ramírez Kidd, *Alterity and Identity in Israel: The גר in the Old Testament*, BZAW 283 (Berlin: WdG, 1999), 18. Some of these are textually dubious, i.e., Judg 5:17; Isa 54:15b.

poetic contexts (e.g., Jer 49:18, 33).¹⁵⁵ This verbal form is most often used in association with Israelites who sojourn out of their towns (e.g., Gen 12:10).¹⁵⁶ The substantive or nominal form גר (*gēr*) occurs 92 times (81 times in the singular!), always in the sense of someone who lives more or less permanently in Israel as a resident alien.¹⁵⁷ Whereas the verb גור mainly occurs in narrative or non-legal texts (i.e., the patriarchal narrative, the deuteronomistic history, Chronicles), the noun גר is mostly confined to legal texts.¹⁵⁸

Although disagreements regarding the identity or identities of the גר abound, the consensus rightly holds that the HB does not maintain a unified picture of the גר. Scholars propose different diachronic accounts on the history of the changing status and identity of the גר, as the ascertainment of the identity of the גר largely depends on how each textual corpus is dated. Yet virtually all maintain that the גר in Leviticus belongs to P/H, which is relatively late. Since Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen, the גר in P/H has often been thought of as someone seeking integration into the *religious community* of

155. A. H. Konkel, "גור," *NIDOTTE* I:837; Ramírez Kidd, *Alterity*, 26–27.

156. Ibid., 23.

157. Four metaphorical usages: Lev 25:23; 1 Chr 29:15; Ps 38:12; 119:19. D. Kellermann, "גור," *ThWAT* I:991; Clines, "גר," *DCH* II:372–73. Whether the nominal form גר was derived from the verbal form גור, or whether גור is a denominative verb is debated. Ramírez Kidd, *Alterity*, 30–34. On the etymology of גר, see: Mark A. Awabdy, *Immigrants and Innovative Law: Deuteronomy's Theological and Social Vision for the גר*, *FAT* 2/67 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 1–5.

158. Ramírez Kidd observes a distinction between the verbal and the nominal forms, and he terms the characteristics of גור and גר as "emigrant" and "immigrant" respectively. He notes that the verb is "often associated with verbs of movement (i.e., Gen 20:1 [נסע]; 2 Kgs 8:1 [הלך]) while the noun is "associated with expressions which point not to the initial move, but to the actual residence of the person in his new home, i.e. 'the גר among you' (i.e., Exod 12:49; Lev 19:33; Deut 14:29)." Ramírez Kidd, *Alterity*, 23. Spina proposes "immigrant" as the most nuanced rendering of גר as well. F. A. Spina, "Israelites as Gerim: Sojourners in Social and Historical Context," in *Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Carol L. Meyers and Michale P. O'Connor, *ASOR: Special Volume Series 1* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 323.

Israel and already well on its way to the later social category of a religious convert or proselyte. Alfred Bertholet's pioneering work popularised this thesis that the גר in P is "ganz und gar ein religiöser Begriff geworden" and refers to a foreigner who lives among the Israelites in the postexilic period.¹⁵⁹ Bertholet's basic thesis remains largely intact even today, as the recent series of major publication show, although the recent contributors carefully modify his view.¹⁶⁰ Furthermore, in spite of the disagreements surrounding the date

159. Alfred Bertholet, *Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden* (Freiburg: Mohr, 1896), 174–75. S. R. Driver also noted over a century ago that D and P/H exhibit diverging conceptions of the גר. S. R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, 3rd ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902). Likewise, Kellermann notes, "Der גר ist weitgehend als Proselyt gesehen." Kellermann, "גר," I:983.

160. In addition to standard reference entries (*ThWAT/TDOT*, *NIDOTTE*, R. Martin-Achard, "גר Gūr," *TLOT* I:307–10; Paul F. Stuehnenberg, "Proselyte," *ABD* V:503–5; David L. Lieber, "Stranger and Gentiles," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 19:241–42), four major studies on גר in the HB have recently appeared: Christiana van Houten, *The Alien in Israelite Law*, JSOTSup 107 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991); Christoph Bultmann, *Der Fremde im antiken Juda: Eine Untersuchung zum sozialen Typenbegriff "ger" und seinem Bedeutungswandel in der alttestamentlichen Gesetzgebung*, FRLANT 153 (Göttingen: V&R, 1992); Ramírez Kidd, *Alterity*; Reinhard Achenbach, Rainer Albertz, and Jakob Wöhrle, eds., *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*, BZABR 16 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011). Mark Awabdy has recently published a comprehensive study of the גר in Deuteronomy: Awabdy, *Immigrants and Innovative*. Also, see: Theophile J. Meek, "The Translation of GĒR in the Hexateuch and Its Bearing on the Documentary Hypothesis," *JBL* 49 (1930): 172–180; Henri Cazelles, "La mission d'Esdras," *VT* 4 (1954): 113–40; P. Grelot, "La dernière étape de la rédaction sacerdotale," *VT* 6 (1956): 174–89; Thomas Marland Horner, "Changing Concepts of the 'Stranger' in the Old Testament," *AThR* 42 (1960): 49–53; Kaufmann, *The Religion*; Spina, "Israelites as Gerim," 321–35; Manfred Görg, "Der 'Fremde' (ger): Ein Fremdwort im Alten Testament," *BN* 25 (1984): 10–13; Morton Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament* (London: Continuum International, 1987); Jacob Milgrom, *Numbers: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*, JPS Torah Commentary (New York: JPS, 1990), 398–402; B. Greger, "Beobachtungen zum Begriff Ger (ger)," *BN* 63 (1992): 30–34; Bernhard A. Asen, "From Acceptance to Inclusion: The Stranger (gēr) in Old Testament Tradition," in *Christianity and the Stranger: Historical Essays*, ed. Francis W. Nichols, SBLSCS 12 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 16–35; Frank Crüsemann, "Human Solidarity and Ethnic Identity: Israel's Self-Definition in the Genealogical System of Genesis" in *Ethnicity and the Bible*, ed. Mark G. Brett (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 57–76; Joosten, *People and Land*; Rolf Rendtorff, "The Gēr in the Priestly Laws of the Pentateuch," in Brett, *Ethnicity and the Bible*, 77–87; Daniel L. Smith-Christopher, "Between Ezra and Isaiah," in Brett, *Ethnicity and the Bible*, 117–42; Ramírez Kidd, *Alterity*; Stuart Krauss, "The Word 'Ger' in the Bible and Its Implications," *JBQ* 34 (2006): 264–270; Lisbeth S. Fried, "From Xeno-Philia

and the *Sitz im Leben* (i.e., preexilic, exilic, postexilic) of each source and the impetus that gave rise to various redactional activities, the chronological order of each source *relative to* each other is much less debated.¹⁶¹ The scope of our discussion here will be restricted to the גר in Leviticus. Comparison with other priestly passages or other sources/traditions will be taken up only insofar as they illuminate Leviticus's understanding of the גר.

Turning the focus now onto Leviticus, who is this גר in 19:33-34? A host of proposals have been put forward. De Vaux thinks the "Law of Holiness in Leviticus" was written "shortly before the Exile" and that "at the end of the monarchy the number of *gerîm* in Judah had increased, and provisions had to be made for them. There had probably been an influx of refugees from the former northern kingdom."¹⁶² Cazelles thinks the גר was an Israelite living in or just returning from exile (in light of Ezra's mission) and the "native" refers to the "Samaritans" who remained in the land.¹⁶³ Cohen argues that the generic term גר is nationals of northern Israel subjected to

to -Phobia: Jewish Encounters With The Other," in *Time of Change: Judah and Its Neighbours in the Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods*, ed. Yigal Levin, LSTS 65; Companion to Qumran Scrolls 8 (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 179–204. For the גר in Genesis, see: Elisabeth Robertson Kennedy, *Seeking a Homeland: Sojourn and Ethnic Identity in the Ancestral Narratives of Genesis*, BibInt 106 (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

161. Most scholars maintain the following order (though there is no agreement on the redactional layers within D and P/H themselves): BC--> D --> P/H. Asen, "From Acceptance to Inclusion," 24. Houten, for instance, proposes the following order: BC (Exod 20; 22-23; 33) --> D (Deut 12-26) --> P/H (Lev 17-26). Similarly, Achenbach proposes: BC (Exod 20:22-23:22) --> D (Deut 12-26) --> H (Lev 17-26) --> later priestly legislation (Num 9; 15; 19; 35). Houten, *The Alien*, 42, 67, 109–10; Reinhard Achenbach, "gêr - nâkhrî - tôshav - zâr: Legal and Sacral Distinctions regarding Foreigners in the Pentateuch" in Achenbach, Albertz, and Wöhrle, *The Foreigner and the Law*, 29–51. On the contrary, Bultmann thinks that the earliest layer belongs to *das deuteronomische Gesetz* of the seventh century BCE, predating BC which apparently is a sixth-century extension of D. Bultmann, *Der Fremde*, 163–74.

162. Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, trans. John McHugh (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961), 75.

163. Cazelles, "La mission," 131.

Judean control especially after the downfall of Samaria.¹⁶⁴ Houten, probably following Vink, reverses Cazelle's proposal and sees "natives" as the Exile returnees and the "Samaritans" as the aliens.¹⁶⁵ Albertz and Nihan believe the גרים of H were foreign resident aliens during the Persian period (ca. the fifth century BCE).¹⁶⁶ Milgrom dates the substantial portion of P/H much earlier, as early as shortly after the monarchial period (with postexilic redactional hand, which he calls "H^R").¹⁶⁷ Following Weinfeld, Milgrom argues against proselytism in ancient Israel (at least until postexilic era) and contends that intermarriage was the only means through which integration to Israel was possible. Thus the גר maintained a distinctive, ethnic identity until at least a generation later. Milgrom summarises that:

...the *ger*, the resident alien of biblical times, is a far remove from the *ger*, the convert of rabbinic times. Conversion as such was unknown in the ancient world. Ethnicity was the only criterion for membership in a group. The outsider could join only by marriage (e. g., Ruth). In fact, it was not those who intermarried but the subsequent generations that succeeded in assimilating and even then not always (e. g., Deut. 23:1–9).¹⁶⁸

164. Matty Cohen, "Le 'ger' biblique et son statut socio-religieux," *RHR* 207 (1990): 131–58.

165. Houten, *The Alien*, 119, 151–55; J. G. Vink, *The Date and Origin of the Priestly Code in the Old Testament*, *OtSt* 15 (Leiden: Brill, 1969).

166. Alberz argues that they were foreigners "who inhabited — shoulder by shoulder with the Judeans — the Persian province of Juhud in the first part of the 5th century, whose multi-ethnic character is known from other sources.... They had to create a cultic and civil legislation for the Judean province, which should come to terms with its considerable non-Judean minority without giving up with religious identity of the Judean majority." Rainer Albertz, "From Aliens to Proselytes: Non-Priestly and Priestly Legislation Concerning Strangers," in Achenbach, Albertz, and Wöhrle, *The Foreigner and the Law*, 59. Also: Nihan, "Resident Aliens and Natives in the Holiness Legislation," in Achenbach, Albertz, and Wöhrle, *The Foreigner and the Law*, 131.

167. Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17–22, 1361–64.

168. Milgrom, *Numbers*, 401; idem, "Religious Conversion and the Revolt Model for the Formation of Israel," *JBL* 101 (1982): 169–76; Moše Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the*

Joosten also thinks גר was a non-Israelite and, like Milgrom, rejects proselytism.¹⁶⁹ The historical identity of the גר is far from settled.

At any rate, the nominal form גר occurs twenty-one times in the book and may be divided into the following categories:¹⁷⁰

גר paralleled with עני	19:10; 23:22
גר equated with תושב	25:23, 35, 47 [x3]
גר seen on a par with	
[i] אזרח	16:29; 17:15; 18:26; 19:33-34 [x3]; 24:16, 22 ¹⁷¹
[ii] בית-ישראל	17:8, 10; 22:18
[iii] בני-ישראל	17:12, 13; 20:2

The least common characterisation of the גר is found in Lev 19:10 and 23:22, where he is juxtaposed with עני and where both of them are given the right of gleaning.¹⁷² These verses go well beyond the legislation of Deut 24:19-22, but

Deuteronomistic School (Oxford: OUP, 1972). Milgrom employs this as an argument against Mendall-Gottwald's Revolt Model hypothesis. George E. Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," *BA* 25 (1962): 66-87; Norman K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 BCE*, BibSem 66 (London: SCM, 1980). For Gottwald's response to Milgrom, see: idem, "Religious Conversion and the Societal Origins of Ancient Israel," *PrST* 15 (1988): 49-65. See also, Anson Rainey's incisive review of Gottwald's book: Anson Rainey, review of *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel 1250-1050 B.C.E.*, by N. K. Gottwald, *JAOR* 107 (1987): 541-43. See also the recent work of Thiessen on conversion: Matthew Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity* (Oxford: OUP, 2011).

169. Joosten, *People and Land*, 54. Joosten maintains that the "changing" status of גר is a change not in the actual status of גר in Israel but in the worldview and theology of P and the way they talk about him. *Ibid.*, 57-58.

170. Lev 16:29; 17:8, 10, 12, 13, 15; 18:26; 19:10, 33, 34 [x2]; 20:2; 22:18; 23:22; 24:16, 22; 25:23, 35, 47 [x3]. Curiously, the occurrence of גר is confined mostly to H. P/H employs the term 36 times, of which 20 times is in H (or, 21 times if 16:29 is counted as a part of H).

171. Cf. Num 15:13, 14, 26, 29, 30; 19:10. Houten, *The Alien*, 120-21. Houten thinks that "the laws stipulating equal treatment in cultic matters are later than laws requiring charity and civil justice for the alien." *Ibid.*, 155.

172. The equation of גר and עני must be considered in connexion with the reason one becomes a גר in the first place. The most recurrent reason in the HB is famine. As individuals or a group they have abandoned their homeland for political or economic reasons and sought refuge in another community. This is certainly the case for several key Israelite

the depiction of the גר here exhibits continuity with the deuteronomic גר who is for the most part a person in need and has the rights of assistance and protection (e.g., Deut 24:14-18).¹⁷³ As the גר was not permitted to possess land, he was in the service of the native-born who presumably acted as his patrons. The גר was dependent on the hospitality of the host, which played an important role in ANE.¹⁷⁴

The standard description of the גר, however, is at variance with this depiction. Albertz rightly stresses, as do Achenbach and Nihan, that the “social attitude” towards the גר recedes to the background in H, especially in the light of the גר in BC (refugees) or Deuteronomy (impoverished alien, day labourers).¹⁷⁵ The גר of Leviticus apparently could not only amass wealth (25:47-54), but he was also financially independent enough to offer sacrifices,

figures: Abraham (Gen 12:10; 23:4), Jacob (Gen 28:4), Isaac (Gen 35:27; 37:1), Moses (Exod 2:22), Elimelech and his family (Ruth 1:1), and the Israelites in Egypt (Exod 22:20). The גר lives amongst people who are not his blood relatives and thus lacks the concomitant protection and privileges that a native enjoys. Another common reason seems to be military encounters, which left people with no choice but to be גרים (i.e., Isa 16:4; 2 Sam 4:3; Jer 35:7). Kellermann, “גור,” I:984.

173. The גר is often mentioned along side of the יתום (‘orphan’) and the אלמנה (‘widow’) in Deuteronomy in a formulaic אלמנה – יתום – גר triad (Deut 24:17, 26:13). Kellermann, “גור,” I:449; Konkel, “גור,” I:837. Leviticus uses the גר-עני dyad instead of the deuteronomic גר-יתום-אלמנה triad.

174. The גר is permitted to participate in the tithe (Deut 14:29), the sabbath year (Lev 25:6), and the cities of refuge (though Deut 19:1-13 does not mention גר, Josh 20:9 and Num 35:15 do so emphatically). Kellermann, “גור,” I:449; Konkel, “גור,” I:837.

175. Albertz, “From Aliens,” 59. Nihan points out: “In *all* other pentateuchal codes, be it the Decalogue (see Exod 20:10 // Deut 5:14), the Covenant Code or the Deuteronomic Code, the גר is exclusively considered as a *dependent* member of the Israelite society, who can survive only by being included into an Israelite household (see Exod 23:12) or by living on the charity of Israelite landowners.” (italics Nihan’s) Nihan, “Resident Aliens,” 113. However, Achenbach opines, “Although they could amass a certain amount of wealth (cf. Lev 25:47), most of them remained poor, because they did not own land (at least according to the Jewish legislation); they thus received protection and welfare together with the other needy groups of the society (cf. Lev 19:10; 23:22; 25:6). Since they had attached themselves to the Israelites, they had to observe the Jewish rules and to conform to the requirements of rest on holy days (Lev 16:29) and to the first commandment (cf. Lev 20:2-3; 24:16).” Achenbach, “gêr - năkhrî,” 41.

even the costly ones like the *עלה* (Lev 17:8-9; 22:18-19; cf. Num 15:14-16).¹⁷⁶

The repeated injunction to treat the *גר* on a par with the *אזרח* in cultic matters also presupposes the financial capacity of the *גר*. Thus, in majority of the cases in Leviticus, the *גר* is “a person, who in spite of his foreign origins, is nonetheless economically independent.”¹⁷⁷

Furthermore, Leviticus closely links the *גר* with *תושב* in four instances (25:23, 35, 45, 47) where they seem to form a nominal hendiadys.¹⁷⁸

Nevertheless, *גר* and *תושב* are not exact synonyms, and a distinction between these terms becomes evident when broader legal contexts are taken into account. For example, Exod 12:43-49 legislates the law of *מצות* (*‘unleavened bread’*) for *כל עדת ישראל* and five different classes of foreigners: [i] *בני־נכר* (*‘foreigners’*), [ii] *עבד איש מקנת־כסף* (*‘purchased slaves’*), [iii] *תושב*, [iv] *שכיר* (*‘hired worker’*), and [v] *גר*. Here, all but [ii] and [v] are excluded from *פסח*.¹⁷⁹

Similarly, Lev 22:10-17 excludes *שכיר*, *תושב* and *זר* from eating the *קדש* (*‘sacred donation’*), but those in the priest’s household (presumably the *גר* as well) are permitted to eat it (vv.11-13). The *גר* is included in the festival of the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:29) alongside the *אזרח*, but no other groups of people are even mentioned. While both the *גר* and the *תושב* may be considered ethnically foreign or distinct when compared to the *אזרח*, they are worlds apart from the legal perspective. In Joosten’s words, *גר* and *תושב* “belong to

176. Albertz, “From Aliens,” 58.

177. Houten, *The Alien*, 156; Nihan, “Resident Aliens,” 117.

178. The nominal form *תושב*, which is related to the verb *ישב*, occurs eleven times in P/H: Gen 23:4; Exod 12:45; Num 35:15; Lev 22:10; 25:6, 23, 35, 40, 45, 47 [x2]. Outside of P/H, Ps 39:12 and 1 Chr 29:15 also establish a clear parallelism between the *גר* and the *תושב*.

179. Num 9:14 permits the *גר* to participate in the Passover, provided that he was circumcised and participates *בחוקת הפסח וכמשפטו*. However, Nihan rightly points out that the inclusion in the *פסח* does not mean full integration into the community of Israel since Exod 12:43-49 denotes “a private domestic ritual” and the *גר* is still “distinguished from the ‘community (עדה) of Israel’” even here. Ibid., 115-16.

different spheres. The term *gēr* ... is a juridical term.... The term *tōšāb* does not define rights, but objectively describes a social condition: a 'sojourner'.¹⁸⁰ Achenbach also observes that תושב is only an "overall term for all forms of residency by aliens, whether they have permanent rights or just limited permission."¹⁸¹

This point is further corroborated by the comparison of the גר with other non-Israelite terms, such as, זר and נכרי.¹⁸² Leviticus mentions בני־נכר only once (22:25); נכר / נכרי is a foreigner who does not intend to stay in Israel and seems to be "beyond the horizon of consideration" from the legal perspective.¹⁸³ זר refers to anyone who is unwarranted or unfit to partake in the cult in Leviticus (22:10, 12, 13). זר clearly includes the foreigners (נכרי) who are for whatever reason not integrated as גרים and thereby excluded "from the cult and from the religious community (cf. Exod 29:33; 30:33)," since they are considered as "impure, uncircumcised, or just unwarranted."¹⁸⁴ As such, while every גר is a תושב, not every תושב is a גר. The גר is distinguished from all the other kinds of foreigners in that he has settled in the land for some time and is recognised as having the special, legal status.

180. Joosten, *People and Land*, 74. Elliger thinks that תושב emphasises one's economic standpoint while גר emphasises one's legal status. Elliger, *Leviticus*, 293; Konkel, "גור," I:837; Houten, *The Alien*, 126–27.

181. Achenbach, "gêr - nâkhrî," 46; Martin-Achard, "גור gūr," I:308.

182. Rendtorff opines, "The Hebrew language uses a number of different expressions to refer to persons who do not belong to the majority, however the latter might be defined. Some of these expressions are generally used in a more negative sense, always emphasizing the otherness of those persons and their separateness from the majority such as *nokrî* (e.g., Deut. 17:15) or *ben-nēkār* (e.g., Exod. 12:43), and *zār* (e.g., Isa. 1:7). In other cases the difference is not as evident and not always emphasized, as with *tōšāb* which is often used together with *gēr* (e.g., Gen 23:4), the latter being the most frequent among these expressions." Rendtorff, "The Gēr," 77.

183. Achenbach, "gêr - nâkhrî," 43–45. Joosten, by contrast, takes Lev 22:25 to permit the בני־נכר to bring sacrifices to the Israelite sanctuary. Joosten, *People and Land*, 75–76.

184. Achenbach, "gêr - nâkhrî," 45.

The גר enjoys protection and rights that do not apply to foreigners who are described merely as זר, שכיר, תושב or נכרי/נכר.¹⁸⁵

When Leviticus commands something in connexion with the גר, it most frequently attempts to put him on a par with the אזרח or בני/בת ישראל.¹⁸⁶ The call for equality between the גר and the Israelites—which is also found in 19:34 (לכם יהיה מכם כאזרח)—is always directed to the Israelites in second person, and the גר is only ever referred to in third person. The repeated emphasis on the equal treatment of the גר as exemplified in the statement like אחד משפט יהיה כאזרח כגר לכם יהיה (Lev 24:22; cf. Exod 12:49; Num 9:14; 15:15ff.) has caused some to think that both the גר and the native-born were on equal footing concerning all of P/H's legislation.¹⁸⁷ Milgrom, however, cautions

185. The uniqueness of the גר seems to be expressed even at the grammatical level. Ramírez Kidd enumerates the following: [i] The גר is almost restricted to its use as a (masculine) singular noun (i.e., the singular/plural ratio for זר, נכרי, גר are 37/33, 13/16, 81/11, respectively). Incidentally, Ramírez Kidd thinks the plural form גרים, which appears eleven times (Exod 22:20; 23:9; Lev 19:34; 25:23; Deut 10:19; Ezek 47:22; Ps 146:9; 1 Chr 29:15; 2 Chr 2:16; 30:25), is restricted to either postexilic, non-legal context or motive clauses of legal texts. Ramírez Kidd, *Alterity*, 30. [ii] The גר does not possess the adjectival value/function that זר and נכרי often do. For instance, נכרי and זר can be used vis-à-vis a very different subject, namely, people/family (Lev 22:12), things (2 Kgs 19:24), body (Prov 5:20), God's deed (Isa 28:21), and so forth. (The appositive use of גר is, however, attested in 2 Sam 1:13 and 2 Chr 2:16.) Ibid., 28-19. [iii] Whereas no suffix is directly attached to זר or נכרי (perhaps because the Israelites aspired only for commercial relations with them), suffixes are often attached to גר (i.e., Exod 20:10; Deut 1:16; 5:14). Ibid., 29. Whatever one makes of these features, the גר seems to be a technical, legal term, which has no exact synonym, and he is "an anonymous figure in the theoretical situations ... no name nor personal events are attached to this noun." Ibid., 28; Kellermann, "גור," I:4498; Joosten, *People and Land*, 55. This in mind, Milgrom observes that it is no accident that those who joined Israel in Babylon are called בני נכר rather than גרים in Isa 56:3, 6. Isa 14:1 is also not an exception in this respect since once foreigners settle in Israel they can become גרים. Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1705.

186. Of the fourteen occurrences of the גר-אזרח pairing in the HB, twelve are found in P/H (six of them in Leviticus: 16:29; 17:15; 18:26; 19:34; 24:16, 22). Joosten argues for semantic distinctions between various addressee terms in H (i.e., בני ישראל, אזרח, בת ישראל), but Houten makes no distinction.

187. Houten, for instance, examines Num 15:15-16 and concludes that חקה אחת לכם ולגר or a statement like it "seems to require a comprehensive interpretation." Houten, *The Alien*, 150.

against extending the application of this statement beyond its immediate context.¹⁸⁸ Joosten likewise asserts that “a certain degree of incorporation does not mean general equivalence” and “the requirement is limited to the cultic prescriptions concerned.”¹⁸⁹ Rendtorff also holds that though the גר is treated like the אֹזֶרָה on cultic matters (i.e., Lev 17) and is co-responsible for matters that concern purity (Lev 18:24-30; 20:1-5; 24:16; Num 19:10-13), “he is still different.”¹⁹⁰

Why, then, do certain laws apply to both the אֹזֶרָה and the גר while others only apply to the אֹזֶרָה? In an attempt to answer this question, Milgrom systematically catalogues the commands as either *prohibitive* or *performative* in nature, which are governed by two different types of rationale.¹⁹¹ On the one hand, the aim of the prohibitive commands is to prevent defilement of the land and the sanctuary, and the standard formulation for this type of commands is negative (לֹא + *imperfect* or אַל + *jussive*). Even though certain types of defilement, such as, bodily discharges (Lev 15:2ff.), were considered natural and inevitable, they still required a sacrifice. The failure to keep these commands resulted in the “sin of commission.” For example, the גר, along with the Israelites, is forbidden repeatedly from eating blood (Lev 17:10-14). If the גר wants to offer a זֶבַח or עֹלָה, he is required to follow the same sacrificial procedure as the Israelite (Lev 17:8-9; Exod 12:48-49; Num 9:14; 15:14), and disconformity is threatened

188. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1496.

189. Joosten, *People and Land*, 63, 69–70.

190. Rendtorff, “The Gēr,” 81.

191. Milgrom, “Religious Conversion,” 170-71. Most scholars accept Milgrom’s basic distinction between prohibitive and performative commands, but some problematise extending this as an all-encompassing category. Rendtorff, “The Gēr,” 84; Albertz, “From Aliens,” 60, n.30.

with *ברת*.¹⁹² Both the *אזרח* and the *גר* are required to undergo special cleansing after eating anything that has died a natural death or been torn up (Lev 17:15-16; cf. Exod 22:30; Deut 14:21). The laws concerning sexual intercourse, the sin of unchastity and Molech worship in chs.18 and 20 are all directed to both parties with the same standard. The legislation for religious offences, such as, blaspheme (24:16) or idolatrous practices (20:2), are also binding for all.¹⁹³ The overarching concern for these prohibitive commands is the maintenance of the purity of the land and the sanctuary, and breaching these purity boundaries had grave consequences for all.¹⁹⁴ Since both the *אזרח* and the *גר* could act as agents of defilement, they were both to observe the same prohibitions. The failure to do so precipitated the same punishment regardless of the transgressor's identity.

On the other hand, the *גר* is treated differently in several places. Certain commands apply only to the Israelite and remain optional for the *גר*. Milgrom calls this type "performative" commands. These laws are derived specifically from Israel's past experience (viz., deliverance from Egypt), and they are chiefly positive in form and prescribe certain kinds of actions, such as, dwelling in booths (Lev 23:41-43) and the Passover (Exod 12:48-49).¹⁹⁵ If the *גר* did not participate in these no defilement was precipitated. It is only the negligence of the *אזרח* that resulted in the "sin of omission" in these cases, and only the Israelites are threatened to be punished by *ברת*.¹⁹⁶

192. On the penalty of *ברת*, see: Houten, *The Alien*, 135; Wenham, *Leviticus*, 282-86; Joosten, *People and Land*, 79-82.

193. Outside of H, they are both under divine protection (Lev 10:18; Ps 146:9), the rites of cleansing with ashes of the red heifer (Num 19) apply to both (Num 18:6ff.). Kellermann, "*גר*," I:987-88.

194. Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, 1706.

195. Joosten, *People and Land*, 64. The different treatments spelled out for Israelite and alien slaves (Lev 25:39-46) are another example.

196. An illustrative example is found in Lev 16. On Yom Kippur, the *גר* is required to

Considering the above, it is clear that while the גר and the אזרח are both equally responsible for maintaining the purity of the land and the sanctuary, it would be incorrect to hold that the גר was on equal footing with the Israelites in all legal matters. Despite the great number of laws that apply equally to the native-born and to the גר, the distinctive identity of the גר can be seen in what is and what is not required of him.¹⁹⁷ Nihan contends:

In short, the case of Exod 12:48-49 indicates that the term גר, in H and related passages, may occasionally include resident aliens who were willing to observe some of the rituals and customs of the Israelites; but it cannot justify the traditional assumption that the גר would consistently refer to “religious converts” or “proselytes” specifically. The term גר, in H, continues to designate a “resident alien,” who has come to the land of Israel with his own civil and religious customs, and who may or may not be willing to adopt the customs of the country in which he has settled. The postulated transformation, in H, from a socio-economic to a predominantly religious category is simply mistaken.¹⁹⁸

To sum up, the גר in Leviticus is a technical term that refers to a non-Israelite (ethnically and thus religiously) who has for one reason or another left his homeland and settled among the Israelites. Although he is described as poor and vulnerable in two places, Leviticus mainly characterises the גר as a relatively independent individual who seeks integration into the Israelite society. The גר is bound to keep the prohibitive commands in order to

refrain from work (a prohibitive command), but he is not commanded to fast (a performative command). Milgrom, “Religious Conversion,” 171.

197. Ibid. Achenbach likewise notes that the גרים are “fully integrated members of the religious community, despite their ethnic, political and economic status, where their position is different from the native-born Israelite citizen (אזרח: Exod 12:19, 48, 49; Lev 16:29, 17:15; 18:26; 19:34; 23:42; 24:16, 22; Num 9:14; 15:13, 29, 30; Josh 8:33; Ezek 47:22; Ps 37:35).” Achenbach, “gêr - nâkhrî,” 41; Nihan, “Resident Aliens,” 120.

198. Ibid., 116-17.

maintain the purity of the land and the sanctuary, but performative commands remain optional for him. Leviticus demands equitable and even loving treatment of the גר by likening him to the native-born, but the text in the same breath carefully differentiates the גר from the אֲזֵרָה.¹⁹⁹ As Kellermann succinctly summarises, the גר occupies “eine Zwischenstellung ein zwischen einem Eingeborenen (אֲזֵרָה) und einem Fremden (נָכְרִי),” although Konkel is probably right to state, “In daily life there was to be no barrier between the alien and the Israelite.”²⁰⁰

2.3.3.2 בְּמוֹד

One unique feature of the levitical love command is the presence of the qualifier בְּמוֹד. This particular construction (כִּמוֹ + דָּ) occurs only twice in the entire book (19:18, 34). While exegetes unanimously agree that both of these occurrences demand a consistent rendering, just how בְּמוֹד should be understood continues to be widely debated.²⁰¹ Two options have mustered most support: [i] adverbial (where it modifies אַהֲבָה) and [ii] adjectival / nominal-relative (where it modifies לוֹ/רַעַךְ).²⁰² The precise sense of the former can be construed in several ways, but most take it to be reflexive where בְּמוֹד

199. Rendtorff contends, “In several respects, the *gēr* is simply included in the cultic life of his surrounding. To what extent he remains unconcerned by certain law is not quite clear.... we have to keep in mind that the laws we have before us in the biblical texts have not been worked out at one time and on one level. Therefore the mention of the *gēr* might have been added at certain places at different times and for different reasons without a consistent drive for systematics and completeness.” Rendtorff, “The *Gēr*,” 84.

200. Kellermann, “גֵּר,” I:983; Konkel, “גֵּר,” I:838.

201. Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten*; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*; Andreas Schüle, “Denn er ist wie Du’: Zu Übersetzung und Verständnis des alttestamentlichen Liebesgebots Lev 19, 18,” *ZAW* 113 (2001): 515–34. Tsuji follows Schüle and takes בְּמוֹד to be adjectival. Tsuji, *The Beginning*, 47. See, also: Clines, “כִּמוֹ,” *DCH* IV:328.

202. See Berthelot’s recent overview of these two options. Katell Berthelot, *L’ “humanité de l’autre homme” dans la pensée juive ancienne*, *JSJSup* 87 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 240–47.

is an elliptical construction for “in the same way you would or should love yourself” or the like.²⁰³ The adjectival rendering likewise could be construed in a few different ways (see below).

Virtually all modern scholars concede that both options are possible, but the majority of them, following in the footsteps of the traditional Jewish (e.g., Ibn Ezra) and Christian interpretation, opt for the adverbial rendering. Schüle identifies two reasons for this:

...zum einen auf dem sachlichen Vergleich mit der Vorstellung von Selbstliebe, wie sie im Alten Testament tatsächlich begegnet, und zum

203. However, Berthelot notes that the adverbial rendering with the reflexive sense is attested but not very frequently in the HB, although many Jewish writers/translators from the Second Temple period (e.g., LXX, Philo) as well as later Christian authors clearly read this veres adverbially. Berthelot, *L'humanité*, 241-42. Also: Schüle, “Denn er ist wie Du,” 519. Milgrom construes the love command as, “You shall love (the good) *for* your neighbour as you (love the good *for*) yourself.” Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1655. Derrett proposes, “... you shall love your ‘neighbour’ *as if he were yourself*”. The original emphasis is thus on the quality of love, not its object.” J. Duncan M. Derrett, “‘Love Thy Neighbor as a Man like Thyself’?,” *ExpTim* 83 (1971): 55–56. Kugel cites Didache 31:1-12 and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Lev 19:18 and suggests: “You shall love your neighbor as you yourself *would be loved*, that is, treat your neighbor with love in the same way that you yourself would want to be treated.” James L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 756. Herrmann thinks כְּמוֹךְ is an ellipsis of אִשֶּׁר אִישׁ כּוֹמֵךְ (ל) וְאַהֲבַת לְרֵעֶךָ. Wolfram Herrmann, “Eurneut כְּמוֹךְ לְרֵעֶךָ Lev 19, 18ab,” in *Von Gott und den Göttern: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*, BZAW 259 (Berlin: WdG, 1999), 114. Mathys contends that כְּמוֹךְ serves only “als Vergleichsgröße” and it should be understood as “so stark wie du dich natürlicherweise selbst liebst.” Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten*, 19. Takeuchi likewise takes the phrase to be adverbial but argues against the reflexive sense and renders כְּמוֹךְ as the object of YHWH's love: “*Tu aimeras ton prochain comme (Je t’aime) toi-même*.” According to Takeuchi, neither self-love nor the likeness/sameness of the neighbour suffices as the ground for the love of neighbour. Instead, YHWH's love for Israel serves this purpose. As the overall emphasis of Lev 19 is on Israel's shared experience of YHWH's deliverance from Egypt, it is the principle of *imitatio dei* that calls for love within the Israelite community. He interprets the sense of Lev 19:18 more fully as, “*Tu aimeras ton prochain et tu le sauveras de ses difficultés par tes propres actes, comme toi-même, qui es aimé par Moi, YHWH ton Dieu, malgré ta faiblesse et ton infidélité, et se sauvé de la maison de servitude*.” Yu Takeuchi, “Redonner sens au précepte de ‘l’amour du prochain’ (Lev19,18ab) — ‘comme toi-même bien-aimé’ —,” *AJBI* 27 (2001): 17.

anderen auf dem sprachlichen Vergleich mit der LXX-Version und ihrer neutestamentlichen Wirkungsgeschichte.²⁰⁴

The common adverbial construal of the levitical love command seems to be so heavily coloured by the knowledge of the later interpretation that it predisposes the reader to pick the anachronistic, adverbial reading of Lev 19:18. The emergence of the grand, Double Love Command tradition seems to have had such a momentous effect on the way Lev 19:18 came to be read that Lev 19:18 can now be hardly read without the NT tradition in mind. To be sure, as it will be argued in Ch.5, it makes more sense to read Lev 19:18 with the adverbial force when it is placed abreast the *Shema* (Deut 6:5). Consider the following deuteronomic injunctions to love God, which all unmistakably have the adverbial force due to the ב-prepositions.²⁰⁵

בכל לבבך ובכל נפשך ובכל מאדך	ואהבת את יהוה אלהיך	6:5
בכל לבבכם ובכל נפשכם	לאהבה את יהוה אלהיכם ולעבדו	11:13
בכל לבבכם ובכל נפשכם	הישכם אהבים את יהוה אלהיכם	13:4
בכל לבבך ובכל נפשך	לאהבה את יהוה אלהיך	30:6

When Lev 19:18 is placed after Deut 6:5, the unambiguously adverbial force of בכל לבבך ובכל נפשך ובכל מאדך becomes highly suggestive for the ambiguous phrase of Lev 19:18. In spite of the different prepositional phrases employed in Deut 6:5 (בכל) and Lev 19:18 (כמוך), the adverbial force of Deut 6:5 seeps through to Lev 19:18.

204. Schüle, “Denn er ist wie Du,” 518.

205. *IBHS*, 196-99 [11.2.5]. Other occurrences of אהב in Deuteronomy is unqualified (21:15-16; 23:6), attached with a ground/motivational clause (10:19; 15:16) or paralleled by other verbal phrases (10:18; 11:1, 22; 15:16; 19:9; 30:16, 20).

Deut 6:5	ואהבת את	יהוה אלהיך	בכל לבבך ובכל נפשך ובכל מאודך
Lev 19:18	ואהבת ל	רעך	כמודך

When and *only* when the levitical command is combined with and read immediately after Deut 6:5, the common adverbial rendering of Lev 19:18 becomes preferable.²⁰⁶ The sum of the parts in this case is different from the individual parts. The meaning of Lev 19:18 emerges onto a new semantic plane only when it is read as part of the Double Love Command tradition of the Gospels. This is perfectly understandable, and in the case of the Double Love Command, the adverbial sense is more fitting for the inclusive or universalistic outlook evidenced in the Gospels (see Ch.5). However, when the levitical love command is isolated from the *Rezeptions-/Wirkungsgeschichte* and read in the original context of Leviticus, the phrase כמודך is much more at home with the adjectival / nominal-relative sense.²⁰⁷

Even when these *wirkungsgeschichtliche* readings are set aside, many continue to assign the adverbial rendering for Lev 19:18. Two grammatical and one conceptual arguments are usually advanced in favour of the

206. Even the LXX translator renders this phrase ambiguously (see Ch.3).

207. Berthelot's recent study independently reaches a similar conclusion. She also points out that whether the adjectival or the adverbial rendering is adopted, "une lecture humaniste" of Lev 19:18 is still possible, though by no means necessary. The adverbial interpretation essentially sees the love command as the positive formulation of the Golden Rule without the dimension of reciprocity. In this case, the motivation for the obedience is "à cause de l'autorité divine dont il émane," and the command simply presupposes the similitude/human commonality between the two parties. On the other hand, if the adjectival rendering "(qui/il est) comme toi," which would be a shorthand for "qui pose d'emblée la ressemblance existant entre soi et le prochain," is adopted, then the commonality in view is not "l'humanité commune du *ger* et de l'Israélite, mais à leur commune expérience de la vie sur une terre étrangère, de la condition d'immigré." In the end, Berthelot rejects the "lecture humaniste" of Lev 19:18, arguing that such a reading does not emerge at least until the end of the Second Temple period. While the grammatical potential has always been there, most ancient interpreters did not read it as such. *Ibid.*, 243-46.

adverbial reading.²⁰⁸ Certainly, the adverbial interpretation is possible, and the grammatical potential for Lev 19:18 to be read this way seems to have always been there.²⁰⁹ Despite the popularity of the adverbial reading, however, the arguments in its favour are tenuous, and several considerations endorse the adjectival reading.

a) The connexion between כּמוֹד and כּנפּשׁ

One commonly held assumption is that כּמוֹד is basically equivalent to כּנפּשׁ (where the construction כּ + נפּשׁ + *suffix* is understood as an adverbial clause). For instance, in 1 Samuel, one finds:

וַיֵּאָהֶב יְהוֹנָתָן כּנפּשׁוֹ (“and Jonathan loved him [David] as his own soul”; 18:1)
 בִּאֲהָבָתוֹ אֹתוֹ כּנפּשׁוֹ (“because he loved him as his own soul”; 18:3)
 כִּי אֲהַבֵּת נַפְשׁוֹ אֲהַבּוּ (“for he loved him as he loved his own life”; 20:17)

At first glance, the formal correspondence between these verses and Lev 19:18 is unmissable—though strictly speaking כּנפּשׁ (*preposition + noun + suffix*) is not the same as כּמוֹד (*preposition + suffix*). Leaving this minor difference aside, if one equates כּמוֹד with כּנפּשׁ and if כּנפּשׁ of 1 Samuel is taken to be a reflexive adverbial clause, then כּמוֹד in Lev 19 should also be read adverbially.²¹⁰ However, Schüle points out that כּמוֹד and כּנפּשׁ are not

208. Nearly all English translations (NIV, NASB, ESV, KJV, NET, JPS, NJB, NRSV, CEV [*‘as much as you love yourself’*], etc.) and recent commentaries opt for the adverbial sense (e.g., Noth; Gerstenberger; Wenham; Levine; Hartley; Kiuchi). Ullendorff proposed that כּמוֹד is a brachylogy of “for he is yourself,” and NEB reflects Ullendorff’s suggestion. Edward Ullendorff, “Thought Categories in the Hebrew Bible,” in *Studies in Rationalism, Judaism and Universalism*, ed. R. Loewe (London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1966), 275-78. Clements follows Ullendorff. Clements, *Loving One’s Neighbour*, 24-25.

209. Though not very frequently, the כּ + *suffix* construction is used with the adverbial force: e.g., Deut 3:20; 5:14; Esth 4:2.

210. Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten*, 6–9.

synonymous.²¹¹ If כִּמּוֹד were to be equated with כִּנְפֶשֶׁךָ, then one would naturally expect to find other instances in the HB where כִּמּוֹד (or more generally כ + *suffix*) is used reflexively in place of or interchangeably with נִפֶּשׁ.²¹² However, this is precisely not the case, and this glaring absence casts doubt on equating כִּמּוֹד with כִּנְפֶשֶׁךָ. Moreover, the contextual senses of אָהַב + כִּמּוֹד and כִּנְפֶשֶׁךָ + אָהַב are quite different in their respective passages. In the oft-cited David-Jonathan narrative (1 Sam 18:1, 3; 20:17), the idea of loving someone כִּנְפֶשׁוֹ marks the readiness “die נִפֶּשׁ auch für den anderen aufs Spiel zu setzen” (italics Schüle’s).²¹³ This “stellvertretende Selbstpreisgabe” or the covenantal bond between David and Jonathan is precisely to which the idiom “love someone כִּנְפֶשׁוֹ” refers. כִּנְפֶשׁוֹ has “eine konkretere Bedeutung als die bloße Selbstbezüglichkeit” in the David-Jonathan narrative, but the same cannot be said for the command to love one’s neighbour כִּמּוֹד in Lev 19:18. Regardless of whether one adopts the adverbial or the adjectival reading of כִּמּוֹד, Lev 19:18 (and v.34) stipulates fair and just treatment of those who are socio-economically inferior rather than describe or demand exemplary self-sacrifice.²¹⁴ The ostensible similarity between כִּמּוֹד and כִּנְפֶשׁוֹ seems to be only in form and not in meaning.

211. Schüle, “Denn er ist wie Du,” 520-24.

212. Ibid., 521.

213. Ibid., 521-22. “Die Liebe zum anderen wie die zur eigenen Seele ist demnach nicht als Vergleich von zwei Referenzen (Selbst- und Nächstenliebe) gedacht, vielmehr geht es um die stellvertreterische Preisgabe der eigenen נִפֶּשׁ, der eigenen Seele, zugunsten des anderen.” Ibid., 522. To be sure, Mathys interprets this in a similar way: “ihm so zugetan sein, so stark an ihm hängen, daß man bereit ist, für sein Leben gleichviel zu tun wie für das eigene, ja es nötigenfalls über dieses zu stellen.” Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten*, 17.

214. Mathys’s contention that אָהַב or the ideal, interpersonal love which Lev 19:18 commands is exemplified by David and Jonathan, but such an assertion seems to rely more on canonical interpretation and theology of interpersonal love rather than on contextual analysis of Leviticus. Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten*, 28.

Even if the equation of כמוד and כנפשו were maintained, the phrase כנפש of Deut 13:7 supports the adjectival, not the adverbial, sense. In Deut 13:7, רעך אשר כנפש, clearly functions adjectivally, emphasising the intimacy or relational proximity between friends.²¹⁵ This phrase, “*your neighbour who is like your soul*” refers to a close friend, and the injunction in context means “selbst wenn dir jemand so nahe steht wie deine eigene נפש, soll dich das nicht zur Abtrünnigkeit verleiten.”²¹⁶

If the facile association of כמוד and כנפשו can be discredited, then one ought to look elsewhere to determine the meaning of כמוד. Schüle lists several instances where a preposition with a pronominal suffix yield clearly attributive sense (את + suffix: Gen 6:18; 28:4; Lev 10:9; בתוך + suffix: Num 35:15), but probably the most compelling parallels are as follows.²¹⁷

נביא מקרבך מאחיד כמני יקים לך יהוה אלהיך	Deut 18:15
נביא אקים להם מקרב אחיהם כמוד	Deut 18:18
אין-כמוד אלהים בשמים ממעל ועל-הארץ מתחת	1Kgs 8:23
הנה נתתי לך לב חכם ונבון אשר כמוד לא-היה לפניך ואחריו לא-יקום כמוד	1Kgs 3:12
הלוא-איש אתה ומי כמוד בישראל	1Sam 26:15
כִּי-אֵין כמוד ואֵין אלהים	2Sam 7:22

215. Mathys asserts that one would expect the full form with אשר כמוד or כמוד הוא for the adjectival reading, but Schüle points out that those full forms are in fact rare (only twice in Gen 44:15; 2 Sam 9:8!), which are the exceptions that prove the rule. Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten*, 9; Schüle, “Denn er ist wie Du,” 526.

216. Ibid., 523.

217. Ibid., 524-27; Takamitsu Muraoka, “A Syntactic Problem in Lev. XIX.18b,” *JSS* 23 (1978): 293.

What strikes the reader is that all these instances actually favour the attributive sense.²¹⁸ As such, the conclusion that כְּמוֹד and נִפְשָׁךְ are not synonymous and that “der attributive Gebrauch präpositionaler Ausdrücke nicht nur möglich, sondern durchaus häufig ist” is well founded on philological grounds.²¹⁹

b) Syntactical constraints of כְּמוֹד

Many scholars assert that כְּמוֹד grammatically cannot stand on its own as an independent or dependant clause, and the adjectival reading of כְּמוֹד must be ruled out for this reason. Mathys makes this typical claim: “Es ist nicht erlaubt, kamôka als selbständigen Neben- oder Hauptsatz aufzufassen und zu übersetzen: ‘der dir gleich ist’ oder: ‘Er ist dir gleich’.”²²⁰ This alleged grammatical problem, however, is really not a problem at all. Satisfactory solutions have already been proposed, and, as noted above, the attributive usages of כ + *suffix* are in fact common (e.g., Deut 18:15, 18; 1 Kgs 3:12; 8:23).

Ehrlich is credited as the first to break with the traditional exegesis among the modern commentators.²²¹ He argues that if the phrase was meant to be rendered adverbially, the author(s) probably would have employed כְּנִפְשָׁךְ instead of כְּמוֹד (cf. 1 Sam 18:3; 20:17). He rejects the idea that the

218. Some of these could be taken adverbially, but such a reading would go against the majority view and the onus would now be on those who advocate the adverbial reading to demonstrate their position.

Regarding Deut 18:15 and 18:18, Muraoka notes that taking כְּמוֹד as an appositional relatively clause (*‘who is like me’*) “could help to account for the unusual positioning of *kamoni* and *kamoka* in Deut. xviii. 15 and 18 respectively....” Muraoka, “A Syntactic Problem,” 295.

219. Schüle, “Denn er ist wie Du,” 526.

220. Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten*, 9.

221. Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, II:65; Muraoka, “A Syntactic Problem,” 293.

universalistic love grounded in self-love could be commanded in Leviticus and proposes an alternative reading:

Tatsächlich ist כְּמוֹד epexegetisch zu רֵעֶךָ und = deinesgleichen, das heisst in diesem Zusammenhang “der wie du ein Israelit ist” Dass Nichtisraeliten von diesem Gebote der Nächstenliebe ausgeschlossen sind, zeigt das Gebot V. 34, das sonst vollends überflüssig wäre.²²²

Muraoka further develops Ehrlich’s observation. Muraoka suggests that כְּמוֹד could be understood as a non-restrictive relative clause in apposition that modifies לְרֵעֶךָ and לוֹ [הַגֵּר], in which case כְּמוֹד would be the compressed form of כְּמוֹד (הוּא) אֲשֶׁר / רֵעֶךָ / גֵּר (cf. Deut 5:14; 8:15).²²³ This would satisfactorily solve the purported grammatical problem. Yet, Muraoka notes that in assigning the adjectival function to כְּמוֹד, a new grammatical problem is introduced in v.34, since “it has not yet been established that a pronominal suffix attached to a noun, verb or preposition can be immediately followed by an adjective or its equivalent modifying the suffix.”²²⁴ He submits that כְּמוֹד in both Lev 19:18 and v.34 should be understood not as a strictly adjectival phrase but as a nominal in apposition (‘a person who is like you’).²²⁵ Whether one adopts Muraoka’s suggestion or not, it must be conceded that כְּמוֹד could be understood as an epexegetis that modifies the neighbour or the גֵּר (viz., “[he is] the like of you” or “er ist wie du”). The common grammatical argument

222. Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, II:65. Mathys explicitly concedes, “Hingegen kann, rein grammatikalisch geurteilt, kamôka als epexegetische Apposition zu l’rē’ka verstanden werden,” though he rejects this suggestion, noting that it adds very little to the meaning of the command. Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten*, 9.

223. Muraoka, “A Syntactic Problem,” 293-94.

224. Ibid., 294-5.

225. In this case כ would be seen as a vestige of the ancient substantive כ (‘likeness’) or אִישׁ כְּמוֹד. Muraoka, “A Syntactic Problem,” 294-95; BDB: כ.

levelled against the adjectival reading dissipates when כְּמוֹךָ is read as an epexegetical clause, or more specifically, as a nominal-relative clause in apposition that modifies the גֵּר/רֵעַ.²²⁶

c) The “ethnic” difference between the רֵעַ and the גֵּר

One more reason for the adverbial reading is routinely put forward. It is commonly asserted that כְּמוֹךָ in v.34 cannot have the adjectival or nominal-relative sense because the statement “the resident alien, who is like you” would be absurd. After all, Leviticus maintains an obvious distinction between the אֲזֵרָה and the גֵּר, so such a statement would be simply untrue. Milgrom’s brusque rebuttal against Ehrlich’s aforementioned proposal takes this as an obvious point that requires no defence: v.34 “demonstrates that in a similar context [i.e., v.18], *kāmôkâ* modifies the verb, not *lô*, and must be adverbial.”²²⁷ This underlying assumption is at the heart of the debate. The logic seems to run as follows: since the love command is directed at the גֵּר who is clearly not a fellow Israelite, the love of the גֵּר is commanded *not because of but in spite of the fact* that he is unlike you. The love command focuses on the quality of love and characteristically sees an analogy between

226. Muraoka observes, “Basic syntactic affinity in deep structure between apposition and non-restrictive relative clause is easily seen in sentences like *Mr Jimmy Carter, President of the United States, visited the snow-bound eastern region* as against *Mr Jimmy Carter, who is President, etc.*” Ibid., 295. Muraoka also makes a logical distinction between two kinds of relative clauses: restrictive, which denotes a property that is inherent in the object and non-restrictive, which specifies an accidental, or variable, quality of a given object. He writes that the distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive clauses “subsists in the following pair of phrases which on the surface of it display identical syntactic structure: *white sugar* vs. *white snow*. In the former, the adjective *white* serves to distinguish white sugar from, say, brown sugar, whereas the same adjective denotes in the latter a property that is inherent in the substance called snow. By the same token, one can distinguish between *rea’ kamo’ka* ‘a neighbour who is like you’ in contrast to a neighbour who is not and *re’aka kamo’ka* ‘your neighbour, who by definition or invariably is like you.’” Ibid., 294.

227. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1655.

self-love and neighbourly love: the *manner* in or the *standard* by which people love themselves should be applied both to the neighbour and to the גר.²²⁸

While such a construal may seem compelling, a few considerations once again undermine its force.

First, the assumption that כּמוֹד in v.34 cannot designate the גר as someone “who is ethnically like an Israelite” could be called into question if Cazelles’s or Vink/Houten’s theories (viz., the גר was either the returnee or the one who remained in the land in the postexilic period) is maintained. These theories would hold that the גר in priestly texts *could refer to* someone who was ethnically an Israelite but legally deemed as an outsider (the גר). If Lev 19:33-34 actually belongs to the postexilic stratum of P/H, which was written as a corrective in such a social milieu, then it is possible that the redactor was responding to the problem of unacceptable social schematisation of intra-Israelite relations (i.e., the returnee as the גר and the non-returnee as the אֲזֵרָה or vice versa). This could explain why the גר is singled out as someone qualitatively (i.e., genealogically) like the native-born (כּמוֹד) while no other foreigner is described in this way. Whether one adopts this solution or not, suffice it to say, unless the returnee/non-returnee theory is definitively ruled out, the claim that the גר could not have been someone “like an Israelite” cannot stand. The alleged historical identity of the גר cannot be the determining factor for preferring the adjectival or the adverbial sense.

228. Seybold avers: “The law of love ... formulates a parallelism between love of one’s neighbor and love of self ... and postulates an equilibrium. The given love of self is taken as the norm and also as a counterpoise, which requires constant balancing against the love of one’s neighbor ... *ke* establishes a norm.” K. Seybold, “כֶּ,” *TDOT* VII:6-7; cf. Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten*, 14. For a list of expositions of R. Akiba, Ben Azzai, and Israel Ba’al Shem Tov (18th cent. founder of Hasidism) and other examples of interpretative traditions, see: Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1653-56.

Second and more importantly, the key issue is not whether the גר was an ethnic Israelite or a foreigner, but the intent of the law in applying the love command to the גר. Consider, for instance, the statement, “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights,” which is grammatically in the indicative and can certainly be uttered as a mere indicative statement. However, the same utterance can be and is in fact often stated in the indicative but with the subjunctive force (that is, as a determination or an aim). When such a statement was written down in the U. N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the purpose of such a statement is not so much to *describe* the present reality—for in our present world, all human beings are not valued and treated as equals—but rather to proclaim an aim in order to direct the thinking of the people and to align the policies to reflect such a value. In the same way, the fact that the love of neighbour and the גר had to be laid down in the legal code suggests that the unloving, or even hateful, acts against the neighbour and the גר were not only possible but likely to be committed. In view of the purpose of the love command, which is to preempt hateful acts or economic oppression of the vulnerable, the function of כְּמוֹד is not simply to state a fact but to level the existing inequality by appealing to the divine perspective. The tenor of the command then is not “love your neighbour and the גר insofar as you or your community considers him as someone like you,” but rather, “love your neighbour and the גר, for they are indeed like you in the eyes of YHWH.” The divine perspective clearly frames the context, as seen by the ensuing motivational clause אֲנִי יְהוָה, which wraps up the whole of vv.33-34. The כְּמוֹד phrase then is not meant to be understood with the conditional force (if s/he is...) but rather with the indicative of

resolve (you ought to consider him/her as...)²²⁹ That Lev 19:34 is trying to instil the idea of the likeness of the גר, despite all the outward differences, is evident in the way the love command appeals to their common experience. Deut 10:19 further clarifies this point.

כי-גרים הייתם בארץ מצרים	כמוך	לו (לגר)	ואהבת	Lev 19:34
כי-גרים הייתם בארץ מצרים		את-הגר	ואהבתם	Deut 10:19

The deuteronomistic version is almost identical to the levitical one, save for the missing qualifier כמוך. The motivational clause in both instances provides the reason rather than manner for the preceding command to love the גר. The command calls the Israelites to love the גר “because you were once just like him in Egypt.” The addition of כמוך as an epexegetical phrase in Leviticus further presses this point, that is, the גר is “someone who shares your experience,” that is, “someone like you.” The call for the Israelites to put themselves in the shoes of the גר based on their past experience rhetorically specifies just why the גר should be loved rather than how. Rendtorff captures this point when he articulates that whenever P employs the גר-אזרח juxtaposition, the point is to press “not their difference or contrast but what they have in common.”²³⁰

Consequently, the common arguments against the adjectival or nominal-relative reading place a one-sided emphasis on the distinction between the גר-אזרח dyad while the stress of Lev 19 falls on their similarity. The argument that the גר was not an ethnic Israelite is irrelevant in considering the *intent* of the text. Vv.11-18 and vv.33-34 emphasise the *similarity* of the Israelites’ experiences and that of the גר by employing the

229. Jackson makes a similar point vis-a-vis the “first” commandment of the Decalogue. Jackson, “Literary Presentation,” 189-90.

230. Rendtorff, “The Gēr,” 81–82.

nominal-relative *בְּמוֹד*, which spells out the *reason why rather than manner in which* one should love. While it is tempting to read a highly developed, universalistic sense into Leviticus, the context calls for a more specific and narrower meaning.

2.4 Conclusion

This chapter has sought to establish the meaning of the levitical love command in 19:18 and 19:34. At the outset, I noted the importance of Lev 19 within the book. Following a word on the structure of Lev 19, the love command was considered in its immediate literary contexts (19:11-18, 33-34) with special reference to four key terms (*אהב, רע, גר, בְּמוֹד*). A few important conclusions may now be drawn.

First, the levitical love command functions as a summary of the ethical section 19:11-18. Vv.11-18 deals with how one ought to treat the neighbour, and the love command in the context is aimed primarily at those who are socio-economically powerful. Vv.11-18 commands those with power and resources to refrain from taking advantage of fellow Israelites; instead, they should provide for them. The love command seems to be couched in the juridical context, although the mandate of love is probably meant to be extended beyond the legal sphere. The scope of the neighbour, however, is confined to the intra-Israelite domain in vv.11-18, and non-Israelites are not in view.

Second, vv.33-34 extends the application of this love command to the *גר*. The fact that the *גר* is singled out among the “non-רַעַךְ” of vv.11-18 raises a number of issues regarding his socio-political place and identity. The recent consensus that the *גר* in P/H is a non-Israelite who seeks integration into the

Israelite society is consonant with the description of the גר in Leviticus. Leviticus for the most part assumes the גר to be a foreigner who enjoys relative, economic independence and social mobility. The repeated command to treat him on a par with the אזרח makes most sense against this backdrop. However, these commands should not be extended beyond their immediate contexts. In addition, for the relative independence and the freedom of the גר, he is still relatively vulnerable, since *“the land remains in H the central foundation for the legal distinction between Israelites and resident aliens”* (italics Nihan’s).²³¹ The fact that the גר by definition could not own land (Lev 25)—a key hard asset—puts him at significant financial risk, and he “remains de facto under the protection (and, therefore, the jurisdiction) of the Judean citizens to whom the Holiness legislation is addressed.”²³² Bearing this in mind, for all the differences between the native-born and the גר and for all the ambiguity that surrounds the identity and the status of the גר, the command to love him כמוך is an extraordinary directive. It tries to level the potential or actual attitudinal disparity between how the Israelites relate to their kinsfolk and the גר in their midst. The love command thus signals the openness of the levitical law. Without nullifying the juridical distinction between Israelites and non-Israelites, Leviticus exhibits a kind of dual emphasis on both the qualitative similitude of the אזרח and the גר and their stark difference.

231. Nihan, “Resident Aliens,” 129. Lev 25:23 stipulates that the land is not to be sold לצמחת (*‘permanently, beyond reclaim’*) as the land belongs to YHWH. The motivational clause here tags the Israelites as גרים and תושבים before YHWH. Similarly, Lev 25:35 also commands the creditor to treat an impoverished Israelite as if he were a גר and תושב. See, Bruce Wells, “The Quasi-Alien in Leviticus 25,” in Achenbach, Albertz, and Wöhrle, *The Foreigner and the Law*, 135–55.

232. Nihan, “Resident Aliens,” 124; Rendtorff, “The Gēr,” 85–86.

Third, while virtually all English translations render כְּמוֹךָ adverbially ('as yourself'), the context calls for the adjectival sense ('who is like yourself'). I have attempted to argue against this conventional interpretation by responding to three common arguments that are hurled against its better alternative. The focus of both Lev 19:11-18 and 19:33-34 is on the *likeness* of the object of love, and the addition of כְּמוֹךָ is meant to stress not how but whom and why one should love the neighbour and the גֵּר. The exclusion of all the "non-גֵּר" foreigners also support this point. The command to love and to treat the גֵּר well is set in view of, rather than in spite of, the fact that Leviticus retains the careful demarcation between the Israelites and the גֵּר. Precisely because the distinction between the גֵּר and the אֲזֵרָח was still operative in the mind of the addressees, it was necessary to cultivate the attitude of love and care for the גֵּר as כְּמוֹךָ or "someone who is like yourself." Only when Lev 19:18 was set side-by-side with the deuteronomistic love command later, which put a remarkable emphasis on the *attitude / manner* by which one ought to love God, did the interpretation of the levitical command acquire the now-famous, adverbial force. As modern readers are so familiar with the Double Love Command of the Gospels, they are unwittingly predisposed to reading the command with a universalistic force that is absent in Leviticus.

Fourth, although the levitical love command does play a vital role in Lev 19 and is an important ethical command, it is precisely *an* important command rather than *the* great command. Despite its significance in ch.19, v.18 is still placed under the overarching call to be holy (v.2), and its application is limited. Additionally, while the love for the גֵּר evidences a noteworthy openness, this is still a far cry from the later, first-century

attitude found in the Gospels. To read the love command as *the* central notion in the Pentateuch or even in the HB, is a product of later reflection propelled by the canonical and theological reading of Lev 19:18.²³³ As valuable and formative such a reading is for other purposes, it would be unjustified to attribute such primacy to the levitical love command on philological grounds. In Leviticus, the love command appears much less like the ultimate, moral ideal of how one ought to think and relate to all humanity and more like a necessary corrective for human frailty.

233. For example, Kaufmann calls the love command as “the climax of biblical morality.” Kaufmann, *The Religion*, 320.

Chapter Three

Lev 19:18 in the Septuagint and the Book of Jubilees

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will examine the levitical love command as it is found in the LXX and Jubilees. The first half will briefly evaluate the translator's particular rendering of Lev 19:18, 34 in the LXX. In order to assess whether כְּמוֹד has been translated adverbially or adjectivally, the broader linguistic usage of pertinent constructions in the Greek OT will be considered. I will pay close attention to any translational patterns that may help us draw a preliminary conclusion on the LXX translator's understanding of the love command. The second half of this chapter will be devoted to the analysis of Jubilees, which displays an interesting interpretative move vis-à-vis Lev 19:18. Then I will synthesise the findings and sketch a picture of how the love command was received and appropriated in these texts.

3.2 Lev 19:18 in the Septuagint

It has long been recognised that the NT quotations of Lev 19:18 (Matt 19:19; 22:39; Mark 12:31, 33; Luke 10:27; Rom 13:9; Gal 5:14; Jas 2:8) are taken from the LXX.²³⁴ While determining the precise "edition(s)" of the LXX that

234. All quotation of the Greek text of Leviticus will be taken from the Göttingen edition: John William Wevers, ed., *Leviticus*, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum II,2

the NT writers used may be well beyond the horizon, a consensus holds that the Septuagint of Leviticus was produced in the third century BCE or earlier, probably by a single translator.²³⁵ The translation seems to be based on the pre-Masoretic Hebrew *Vorlage(n)*, which is probably closely represented by the Masoretic Text. But why consider a *translation* of Lev 19:18 and 19:34?

A study of the LXX-Lev is necessary because an idea or a command expressed in one language (source language) does not always retain its original nuance, or even the meaning, when it is translated into a different language (target language). Since many of the key Jewish interpreters of Lev 19:18 seem to have read the scripture in Greek, a careful consideration of the Greek text against the underlying Hebrew text is in order. While this point should not be exaggerated, translation is never a purely linguistic endeavour; for an extended scriptural text like LXX-Lev, translation necessarily involves making interpretative decisions at times. Precisely because the overall sense of the levitical love command is ambiguous in Hebrew, the comparison of the Hebrew phraseology with its Greek counterpart is particularly fruitful. Examining how the LXX translator rendered Lev 19:18 and 34 reveals

(Göttingen: V&R, 1986).

235. Strictly speaking, the term “Septuagint” or the LXX refers to the Greek translation of the Pentateuch, which was undertaken prior to the mid-second century BCE at the latest. Yet, the term has often been extended to include all the books now found in the HB and even other apocryphal writings. For the sake of convenience, I will use the term the Septuagint to refer to the Greek translation of all the books included in the HB. When I wish to restrict the reference to the Greek Pentateuch, I shall specify it as LXX-Pentateuch. For surveys of the LXX scholarship, see: Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, JBS 8 (Jerusalem: Simor, 1997); Jennifer M. Dines, *The Septuagint, Understanding the Bible and Its World* (London: T&T Clark, 2004); Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993), 1-25; Abraham Wasserstein and David Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today* (New York: CUP, 2006); Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*, Biblical Studies and Religious Studies (Leiden: Brill, 2000); Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000).

something about how the love command was understood by the translator. LXX-Lev renders Lev 19:18 and 19:34 as *καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν* and *καὶ ἀγαπήσεις αὐτὸν [προσῆλυτον] ὡς σεαυτόν*, respectively. Scholars almost unanimously take the translation of *בְּמוֹךְ*, that is, *ὡς σεαυτόν*, as a reflexive, adverbial modifier that defines the manner by which one should love (*‘love... as you would love yourself’*).²³⁶ If the LXX translator intentionally “clarified” the grammatical ambiguity by transforming the adjectival sense to the adverbial sense, then the Greek translation is without a doubt an overt act of interpretative disambiguation, viz., a hermeneutical move. The translator’s choice seems to have been the most natural outworking of his theological outlook, and he was engaging with the question of how to appropriate the Torah into his own Greek-speaking, Alexandrian Jewish Diaspora context.²³⁷ This then may be thought of as one of the several instances in LXX-Lev where the translator attempts to make the text speak, as it were, to the exigencies of his day. However, is this really the case?

This question will be treated in detail below, but the consideration of the Greek translation of Lev 19:18 and 19:34, in particular the phrase *בְּמוֹךְ*, is

236. Charles Thomson’s 1808 translation renders LXX-Lev 19:18b as “but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,” and Brenton’s subsequent, more widely used translation “and though shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.” Charles Thomson, *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Covenant, Commonly Called the Old and New Testament: Translated from the Greek* (Philadelphia: Jane Aitken, 1808); Sir Lancelot C. L. Brenton, *The Septuagint in English* (London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1851). More recently, Büchner renders it as “and you shall love your neighbor as yourself,” and Harlé and Pralon translate it as “et alors tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même.” While Harlé and Pralon devote some space to discussing how the sense of *καὶ* should be construed in the context, they simply take for granted the adverbial, reflexive sense of *ὡς σεαυτόν* and detect no difference between the NT and the LXX uses of this phrase. Büchner, “Leuitikon,” 99; Paul Harlé and Didier Pralon, *La Bible d’Alexandrie: le Lévitique: Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et Notes* (Paris: Cerf, 1988), 167-68.

237. John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*, SCS 44 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), x; Jellicoe, *The Septuagint*, 29-58; Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint*, 35-36.

complicated by at least two factors. First, the $\text{כמו} / \text{כ} + \text{suffix}$ construction occurs only twice in Leviticus, and not once is the construction אזהב followed closely by $\text{כמו} / \text{כ}$ outside of Leviticus. This paucity of comparative evidence slightly complicates the analysis. Second, ancient translators did not leave behind the discussion of their translation methodologies. While the well-known prologue of Ben Sira (1:15-26) presents an awareness of the difficulties associated with translation, no direct treatment of translation methodology is taken up in this period.²³⁸ In his illuminating study, Brock analyses Greek XII Prophets fragments and identifies several attempts to bring the Greek text more in line with the Hebrew original.²³⁹ Brock

238. One of the major debates in Septuagint studies was the existence of the so-called “Septuagint Greek.” That the LXX exhibits certain linguistic features that are peculiar is beyond doubt, but how one should explain these phenomena has been widely disputed. According to J. A. L. Lee, two main types of explanation are possible. On the one hand, the linguistic peculiarities could be attributed to the fact that the LXX is “a translation of a Hebrew original, executed according to methods which frequently led to the reproduction of Hebrew idiom in the translating language”; on the other hand, the LXX Greek could be construed as being “largely independent of the fact of translation.” J. A. L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*, SCS 14 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1983), 12. The latter view theorises that Semitism was a widespread linguistic phenomenon in Alexandria, which created a living dialect, or an “Alexandrian Jewish,” Greek. Thus, the LXX can be viewed as written in this distinct (and corrupted?) dialect, and all the peculiarities of the LXX can be explained socio-linguistically. Gehman recently advocated this view: Henry S. Gehman, “The Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek,” in *Septuagintal Lexicography for the IOCS and SBL Seminar on Lexicography*, ed. Robert A. Kraft, SCS 1 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1972), 92–101. Although one cannot *a priori* preclude this latter view, the majority of scholars take the former view, which was articulated by Deissmann. The recent LXX scholars increasingly favour the former view and emphasises the “essentially Koine Greek” nature of Septuagint Greek. See Horsley’s extensive and persuasive refutation of the “Jewish Greek” theory. G. H. R. Horsley, *Linguistic Essays*, New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity 5 (North Ryde, NSW: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1989), 6ff. Also, see: T. V. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in The Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (Oxford: OUP, 2001). However, due to its special nature as a translation, the study of the LXX requires a methodological approach that differs from those applied to the HB or the NT, namely, the close examination of “translation technique.” In any case, the dissemination of the LXX must have had a significant impact on Koine Greek, somewhat comparable to the way in which the appearance of the King James Version made an impact on the English language.

concludes that “the polarisation of attitudes to biblical translation ... was taking place during the last two centuries before the turn of the Common Era.”²⁴⁰ He categorises and characterises these polarised attitudes under *expositor* and *interpre*.²⁴¹

Expositor

- translation oriented towards reader;
- translator has a self-confident attitude to his role;
- translator will seek to resolve any difficulties in the original and will shun nonsense renderings;
- unit of translation is large (i.e. phrase, sentence or even paragraph);
- concern is primarily with the *signifié*, what is signified by the word employed;
- dynamic renderings will be preferred (e.g. use of cultural equivalents, change of grammatical categories).

Interpres

- translation oriented towards source text;
- translator has a self-deprecating attitude to his role;
- translator will simply pass on any difficulties in the original, even if the rendering makes nonsense;
- unit of translation is small (i.e. word, or even bound morpheme);
- concern is primarily with the *signifiant*, the actual word employed;
- formal renderings will be preferred, including exact representation of grammatical categories;
- a concern for stereotyping (i.e. regular use of lexical equivalents), etymologizing renderings etc, free use of syntactic and semantic calque.

239. Sebastian P. Brock, “To Revise or Not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation,” in *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (Manchester, 1990), ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars, BJS 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 301–38.

240. Ibid., 301–2.

241. Ibid., 312–13.

Brock adumbrates five stages of historical development regarding the attitude of translators and observe that at least during the “first stage” in which the translation of the Greek Torah was undertaken, the translators functioned as *interpretes*. Brock writes, “At this stage, there is no clear awareness of the sharp dichotomy in translation practice, probably already current in the gentile world, between the literary translator (or expositor) and the non-literary (or interpretes).”²⁴² The contrast of *expositor* and *interpretes* roughly corresponds to the age-old polarity of “literal” versus “free” (or any of its numerous variants), which modern scholars have come to employ as a shorthand for characterising the general attitudes or the translation technique of the ancient translators.²⁴³ Thus, in the case of LXX-Lev, the

242. Ibid., 325.

243. For all the widespread usage of the term “translation technique” in Septuagint Studies, the term has come under serious discussion only in recent years. Tov summarises: “In the professional literature that term has become a terminus technicus denoting the special techniques used by translators when transferring the message of the source language into the target language. This includes the choice of equivalents, the amount of adherence to the Hebrew text, the equivalence of Greek and Hebrew grammatical categories and etymological exegesis.... A major difference between the study of language and of translation technique is that the latter takes the categories of the Hebrew as its point of departure, while the study of the grammar of the LXX necessarily starts from the categories of the Greek language.” Tov, *The Text-Critical Use*, 39-40. That the translators made various translational decisions is indisputable, but whether or not these decisions should be considered as “special technique” has been widely debated. A number of scholars have taken issues with this assumption that the translators consciously and perhaps mechanically used a special “technique” for their translation. Muraoka, for one, thinks the term is misleading and prefer to speak of “translation strategy or art of translation.” T. Muraoka, “Translation Technique and Beyond,” in *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999*, ed. Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä, Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82 (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: V&R), 15. Sollamo agrees with Muraoka but asserts that “a more suitable term has not yet been found.” Raija Sollamo, “Introduction,” in Sollamo and Sipilä, *Helsinki Perspectives*, 7. Aejmelaeus maintains in contrast to Tov who articulates a fairly cut and dried definition: “Translation technique cannot be anything more than a collective name for all the different renderings used by a translator. Study of translation technique aims at describing what the result of the work of a translator turned out to be like. It cannot be a question of discovering the system used by the translator, because there was none. But although the work of the translator was not systematic, the work of the scholar must be. The only thing

translator seems to have worked as *interpretes* and in an *ad hoc* manner. Again Brock observes, "The earliest translators, lacking any real precedent, work in an *ad hoc* fashion, producing somewhat uneven renderings that veer between the rather free and the literal."²⁴⁴ Similarly, Wevers characterises LXX-Lev as follows:

As translation, Lev is more of an isolate type of translation than a contextual one. A purely 'isolate' translation would simply be a word for word set of equivalences for Hebrew lexemes in the Greek with little regard for the context in which such were used. Terms such as 'isolate' and 'contextual' are not used in an absolute sense; rather one can say that, compared to Gen and Exod, Lev is much more isolate than contextual in character.²⁴⁵

that is systematic about translation technique is the study of it." Anneli Aejmelaesus, "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator," in *VII CIOSCS, Leuven, 1989*, ed. Claude E. Cox, SBLSCS 31 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 27. Some qualifications are needed for Aejmelaesus's assertion. Studies of translation technique (or strategy) cannot be about discovering the translators' *conscious implementation* of the translation-technical system. That the translators of the Pentateuch were at times systematic is undisputed, but just how "conscious" the translators were of this fact remains unsolved (unless one has access to the translators' explanation of their translational strategy). Just as every human language speaker is at the least vaguely aware of the fact that his/her language operates within a linguistic universe of certain grammatical rules, it would be difficult to conceive that the ancient translators were completely unaware of some type of linguistic universe within which they operated. In this sense, the translators were entirely conscious of the "system" within which their work was conceived and employed certain "techniques" that was appropriate to transfer the meaning of a given word or sentence from the linguistic domain of the source language to that of the target language. Still, one must carefully maintain the distinction between the translators' awareness of the existence of a linguistic system on the one hand and their capability to assess and speak critically about the system on the other. Just as a native English speaker is capable of formulating a good, grammatical sentence in English without knowing many (even any) grammatical terms (e.g. nouns, gerunds, participles, modals, etc.), it seems reasonable to assume that the translators were able to implement a sophisticated translation "system" without necessarily possessing the taxonomical vocabulary to articulate it. The translators' awareness in this sense has little, if any, to do with the existence of some kind of a system. Competence, even brilliance, in translation is largely independent of the translators' ability to talk about the theoretical framework of translation or methodology implemented.

244. Brock, "To Revise," 325.

245. Wevers, *Notes on LXX-Lev*, ix. Also, see: *Ibid.*, ix-xxv, 290-313. Büchner agrees that

The general tendency of the translator of LXX-Lev then was to refrain from “solving” difficulties or ambiguity of the underlying text. However, since he was not always consistent, each instance must be carefully evaluated. The following section will appraise the phrase ὡς σεαυτόν against the germane linguistic data derived from the LXX.

3.2.1 Interpretative disambiguation?: ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν

Lev 19:18	ואהבת לרעך כמוך καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν
Lev 19:34	ואהבת לוֹ [גר] כמוך καὶ ἀγαπήσεις αὐτόν [προσέλυτον] ²⁴⁶ ὡς σεαυτόν

The translation of Lev 19:18 and 19:34 is straightforward for the most part. The LXX renders the perfect form of אָהַב, which clearly has an imperative force (modal perfect), with the future indicative of ἀγαπάω. The Greek future indicatives are commonly used to render Hebrew perfects that function imperatively, and a similar translational phenomenon is already found in 19:2 and 19:37 where עשיתם, שמרתם, אמרת are rendered with ἐρεῖς, φυλάξεσθε, ποιήσετε. The dative construction in Hebrew (noun + לוֹ) is rendered with the accusative phrase in Greek, effectively eliminating the formal distinction

“the Leuitikon translator is not consistent in the way he goes about things. Even though in most cases he works atomistically, ignoring Greek idiom, the odd exception occurs. In this he is quite distinct from the translators of Deuteronomy and Exodus, for example.” Dirk L. Büchner, “Leuitikon,” in *NETS*, 84.

246. In the light of recent advances in the study of LXX translation technique, Thiessen argues against the traditional rendering of προσήλυτος as a “proselyte” or “convert” and suggests that προσήλυτος at the time of Greek translation meant “resident alien”: Matthew Thiessen, “Revisiting the προσήλυτος in ‘the LXX,’” *JBL* 132 (2013): 333–50.

between אהב ל and אהב את that is maintained in Hebrew. Moreover, the pronominal suffix of כמו is given an explicitly reflexive sense in Greek with a reflexive personal pronoun σεαυτόν. The greatest difficulty lies in determining whether the construction ὡς σεαυτόν is a phrase with the reflexive *adverbial* or the reflexive *adjectival* force. Does ὡς + *pronoun* typically require an adverbial rendering? As aforementioned, the English translations of the LXX clearly answer this in the affirmative. However, this assumption needs to be carefully reconsidered. A survey of the Greek construction ὡς + *pronoun* in the LXX (and in the NT; see Ch.5) complicates the picture.

Two points of observation need to be noted at the outset. First, while כמו + *pronoun* occurs twenty-five times²⁴⁷ and כ + *pronoun* three times²⁴⁸ in the Pentateuch, these constructions can be used either adverbially or adjectivally / nominal-relatively in various contexts. Even if we hone the search further to the nine occurrences of כמו + *second person pronoun* in the Pentateuch, the same observation holds. Second, the Greek translation uses variegated phrases to render this particular Hebrew construction (i.e., οἷος + *pronoun*, ὡς / ὥσπερ + *pronoun*, τοιοῦτο, ὡσαύτως, etc.), and as such, there is no single, stereotypical rendering. With these in mind, one may note the thirty-two occurrences of the כמו + *second person pronoun* construction in the HB.²⁴⁹ Subtracting two occurrences in Leviticus and two more in Jer 10:6-7, which are missing in the LXX, the twenty-eight occurrences of כמו + *second person suffix* may be tabulated as below:

247. Four times in Genesis (34:15; 41:39; 44:15, 18), eleven times in Exodus (9:14, 18, 24; 10:14; 11:6 [x2]; 15:11[x2]; 30:32, 33, 38), twice in Leviticus (19:18, 34), once in Numbers (23:10), and seven times in Deuteronomy (4:32; 5:14; 5:26; 7:26; 18:15, 18; 33:29).

248. I.e., ככס in Num 15:15; Deut 1:11; 3:20.

249. Viz., Gen 41:39; 44:18; Exod 15:11; Lev 19:18, 34; Deut 5:14; 18:18; 33:29; Judg 8:18; 1 Sam 26:15; 2 Sam 7:22; 1 Kings 3:12–13; 8:23; 13:18; 22:4; 2 Kings 3:7; Jer 10:6–7; Mic 7:18; Ps 35:10; 50:21; 71:19; 86:8; 89:9; Job 35:8; 1 Chr 17:20; 2 Chr 6:14; 18:3.

ὅμοιός	x16	Exod 15:11 (x2); Deut 33:29; Judg 8:18; 1 Kgs 3:12; 3:13; 2 Kgs 3:7; Ps 35:10; 50:21; 71:19; 86:8; 89:9 [LXX 34:10; 49:21; 70:19; 85:8; 88:9]; Job 35:8; 1 Chr 17:20; 2 Chr 6:14,
ὥς	x3	1 Sam 26:15; 2 Sam 7:22; 1 Kgs 3:12; 8:23
ὥσπερ	x3	Deut 5:14; 18:18; Mic 7:18
οὕτως (καὶ)	x2	1 Kgs 22:4; 2 Chr 18:3
καθὼς	x1	1 Kgs 13:18
σου	x1	Gen 41:39
σὺ εἶ μετὰ	x1	Gen 44:18
καθ' ὑμᾶς	x1	Job 12:3

The *כמו* + *second person suffix* construction in the HB is most frequently rendered with an adjective *ὅμοιός* + *second person pronoun* (ca. sixty per cent of the occurrences). Related constructions in Gen 41:39, 44:19 and 1 Kgs 13:18 clearly have the adjectival force as well. The object of comparison in the list above is quite diverse, ranging from Joseph (Gen 41:39; 44:18) to God / YHWH (Exod 15:11; Mic 7:18; 1 Chr 17:20), Ahab (2 Chr 18:3) and so forth.

Other constructions like *ὥσπερ* + *pronoun* (Deut 5:14; 18:18; Mic 7:18) and *οὕτως (καὶ) σὺ* (1 Kgs 22:4; 2 Chr 18:3) above may be taken as adverbial.²⁵⁰ For example, if *כמוך* of Deut 5:14 is taken to modify *יְנוּחַ* or if *כמוך*, which is combined with *כמוני* in 2 Kgs 3:7, is seen as modifying the act of *עלה*, then *ὥσπερ* + *pronoun* would be construed adverbially in these cases. Deut 18:18 is another ambiguous case where *כמוך* may be modifying either *נביא* (adjectival / nominal-relative, 'a prophet who is like you') or *אקים* (adverbial, 'I will raise a prophet as I have raised you'). *מִי אֵל כְּמוֹךָ* (τίς θεὸς ὥσπερ σὺ) in Mic 7:18

250. Louw and Nida define *ὥσπερ* as "somewhat more emphatic markers of similarity between events and states" is used three times (Deut 5:14, 18:18; Mic 7:18). J. P. Louw and Eugene Albert Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989), 64.13.

seems to have the adjectival sense “*who is a god like you?*” rather than “*who is a god who acts as you do?*” as well. Naturally, the most relevant construction for Lev 19:18 is *ὥς + reflexive pronoun*. The one and only parallel construction *ὥς + reflexive personal pronoun* is found in the LXX:

Ps 104:22 τοῦ παιδεῦσαι τοὺς ἄρχοντας αὐτοῦ ὥς ἑαυτὸν (בנפשו)
καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους αὐτοῦ σοφίσει.
to educate his officials to be like himself
and to teach his elders wisdom.²⁵¹

In Ps 104 (MT: Ps 105), *ὥς + reflexive personal pronoun* is used to translate בנפשו. While the antecedent of the suffix on בנפשו (or the pronoun of ὥς ἑαυτὸν) could refer to either the מלך (v.20; βασιλεὺς) or Joseph, it is clear that Joseph is to educate the officials “to act/be like Pharaoh/Joseph himself,” rather than to educate the officials who were already “like Pharaoh/Joseph himself.” Alternatively, it could mean, “to educate the officials as (the king would) himself.” The ambiguity still lingers.

Since the parallel usage above alone cannot bear the weight of the interpretative decision, we may widen our search further. Of the 84 occurrences of the כּו + *pronoun* construction and the 13 occurrences of כּ + *pronoun* found in the HB, the LXX uses *ὥς + pronoun* in the following instances:

- כּו + *pronoun* -

Gen 34:15 ἐὰν γένησθε ὥς ἡμεῖς καὶ ὑμεῖς
Exod 9:14 ἵν' εἰδῇς ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὥς ἐγὼ
Deut 5:26 ἥτις ἤκουσεν φωνὴν θεοῦ ζῶντος λαλοῦντος ἐκ μέσου τοῦ πυρὸς ὥς ἡμεῖς
Deut 18:15 προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὥς ἐμὲ ἀναστήσει σοι κύριος ὁ θεός σου

251. Albert Pietersma, “Psalms,” in *NETS*, 599.

Judg 9:48 Τί εἶδετέ με ποιοῦντα, ταχέως ποιήσατε ὡς καὶ ἐγώ
 1 Sam 26:15 καὶ εἶπεν Δαυιδ πρὸς Αβεννηρ Οὐκ ἀνὴρ σύ; καὶ τίς ὡς σὺ ἐν Ἰσραηλ;
 2 Sam 7:22 ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὡς σὺ καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν θεὸς πλὴν σοῦ ἐν πᾶσιν
 2 Sam 18:3 ὅτι σὺ ὡς ἡμεῖς δέκα χιλιάδες
 1 Kgs 3:12 ὡς σὺ οὐ γέγονεν ἔμπροσθέν σου καὶ μετὰ σέ οὐκ ἀναστήσεται ὅμοιός σοι.
 1 Kgs 8:23 οὐκ ἔστιν ὡς σὺ θεὸς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω
 2 Chr 18:3 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ὡς ἐγώ, οὕτως καὶ σύ· ὡς ὁ λαός σου, καὶ ὁ λαός μου

- כ + *pronoun* -

Num 15:15 ὡς ὑμεῖς, καὶ ὁ προσήλυτος ἔσται ἔναντι κυρίου
 Deut 1:11 κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν προσθείη ὑμῖν ὡς ἐστὲ χιλιοπλασίως
 Jer 43:32 καὶ ἔτι προσετέθησαν αὐτῷ λόγοι πλείονες ὡς οὗτοι.
 Eccl 9:12 ὡς αὐτὰ παγιδεύονται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
 Ezra 4:2 ὅτι ὡς ὑμεῖς ἐκζητοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν
 1 Chr 21:3 Προσθείη κύριος ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὡς αὐτοὶ ἑκατονταπλασίως

While each of the above could be discussed in detail, a couple of illustrative examples will be sufficient to make the point clear. Consider the five instances of ὡς + *second person pronoun* (ὡς σὺ) below, which offer the closest parallel to ὡς σεαυτόν of Lev 19:18, 34.

1 Sam 26:15 καὶ εἶπεν Δαυιδ πρὸς Αβεννηρ Οὐκ ἀνὴρ σύ; καὶ τίς ὡς σὺ ἐν Ἰσραηλ;
 (וְיָמִי כִמְוִי בִישָׁרָא) καὶ διὰ τί οὐ φυλάσσεις τὸν κύριόν σου τὸν βασιλέα;
 ὅτι εἰσῆλθεν εἷς ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ διαφθεῖραι τὸν βασιλέα κύριόν σου.
 2 Sam 7:22 ἕνεκεν τοῦ μεγαλῦναί σε, κύριέ μου κύριε, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὡς σὺ (וְיָמִי כִמְוִי)
 καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν θεὸς πλὴν σοῦ ἐν πᾶσιν, οἷς ἠκούσαμεν ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶν ἡμῶν.
 1 Kgs 3:12 ἰδοὺ πεποίηκα κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου· ἰδοὺ δέδωκά σοι καρδίαν φρονίμην καὶ
 σοφὴν, ὡς σὺ (וְיָמִי כִמְוִי) οὐ γέγονεν ἔμπροσθέν σου καὶ μετὰ σέ οὐκ
 ἀναστήσεται ὅμοιός σοι (וְיָמִי כִמְוִי).
 1 Kgs 8:23 καὶ εἶπεν Κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραηλ, οὐκ ἔστιν ὡς σὺ θεὸς (וְיָמִי כִמְוִי) ἐν
 τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω φυλάσσω διαθήκην καὶ ἔλεος τῷ
 δούλῳ σου τῷ πορευομένῳ ἐνώπιόν σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ,

In 1 Sam 26:15, David's rhetorical enquiry to Abner, τίς ὡς σὺ ἐν Ἰσραηλ (מי כמוך בישראל), is prefaced and paralleled with οὐκ ἀνὴρ σὺ (הלוא איש אתה). English translations rightly take these phrases adjectivally. Attributing the adverbial sense to these phrases ("Do you not act as a man? Who acts as you do in Israel?") would be both unnatural and forced. The first phrase οὐκ ἀνὴρ σὺ (הלוא איש אתה) should be translated as "Are you not a man?" and its parallel τίς ὡς σὺ ἐν Ἰσραηλ (מי כמוך בישראל) as "Who is like you in Israel?". Similarly, אין כמוך in 2 Sam 7:22 and 1 Kgs 8:23 could be translated somewhat awkwardly as "there is none [that acts] as you do," but the most natural rendering is 'there is none [who is] like you'. Furthermore, 1 Kgs 3:12 is particularly revealing in this regard, as the double occurrences of כמוך in the same verse are translated differently as ὡς σὺ and ὅμοιός σοι. The first, explicitly adjectival כמוך, or more fully אשר כמוך ("who [is] like you"), is rendered with ὡς σὺ, and the second כמוך is likewise rendered adjectivally with ὅμοιός. At least in 1 Kgs 3:12 ὡς σὺ and ὅμοιός σοι are synonymous. Accordingly, even though the ὡς + second person pronoun construction is not numerous, the ones that avail us actually favour the adjectival/nominal-relative sense for the most part.

One more passage in the LXX is worth noting. Ben Sira, which was composed probably in the first quarter of the second century BCE, contains a telling construction in 13:15-16:²⁵²

Πᾶν ζῶον ἀγαπᾷ τὸ ὅμοιον αὐτῷ καὶ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ.
 πᾶσα σὰρξ κατὰ γένος συνάγεται, καὶ τῷ ὁμοίῳ αὐτοῦ προσκολληθήσεται ἀνὴρ.
 Every living thing loves what is like to it, and every person his fellow. All flesh
 congregates according to kind, and with one like himself will a man cleave.²⁵³

252. John J. Collins, "Ecclesiasticus, or The Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach," in *OBC* (Oxford: OUP, 2007), 667–98.

253. Benjamin G. Wright, "Sirach," in *NETS*, 729.

MS-A of the Hebrew text runs כל הבשר יאהב מינו / וכל אדם את / הדומה לו (13:14).²⁵⁴ The syntactical structure of Sira 13:15 is compressed, but without doubt its fuller formulation would run as follows:

a πᾶν ζῷον	b ἀγαπᾷ	c τὸ ὅμοιον αὐτῷ
a' πᾶς ἄνθρωπος	b' (ἀγαπᾷ)	c' τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ

These parallel phrases hold that every living creature, including every human, loves its own kind or the likeness of itself. What is remarkable here is the stress placed on the *likeness* (ὅμοιον) of the object of love, rather than the manner in which one loves.²⁵⁵ The focus here, as in Lev 19:18, is the similitude of the object, not the quality of love. This at least suggests that the adjectival sense of Lev 19:18 both in the Hebrew and Greek texts would not be foreign to the Jewish conceptual world of this period.

3.2.2 Interim summary: the ambiguity of כּמוֹךְ and ὡς σεαυτόν

We have sought thus far to examine inductively the interpretation of Lev 19:18 by the translator of LXX-Lev. In particular, we have questioned if the translator of LXX-Lev disambiguated the love command in 19:18 and 19:34. The answer is both in the affirmative and in the negative.

Two points of observation need to be highlighted from the preceding analysis. On the one hand, the LXX translator did clarify the ambiguity of the

254. Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*, VTSup 68 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 41.

255. *Let. Aris.* 228 evidences another emphasis on “likeness” of the object of love in a related conceptual milieu. See the appendix by Thackery in: Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, ed. H. St J. Thackeray and Richard Rusden Ottley (Cambridge: CUP, 1914), 558. Also note: 1 Macc 12:43 (ὑπακούειν αὐτοῦ ὡς αὐτοῦ).

levitical love command by construing Lev 19:18 with an explicitly reflexive sense. By rendering כְּמוֹךָ as ὥς σεαυτόν, LXX-Lev assigns a reflexive sense to the levitical love command. As shown in the previous chapter, Lev 19:18 does not require this reflexive sense in Hebrew (though most take it this way). In LXX-Lev, however, the love command has been unmistakably fused with the reflexive sense. On the other hand, the assumption that ὥς σεαυτόν is necessarily adverbial is unwarranted. The assumption that ὥς + *pronoun* always or even usually functions adverbially is decidedly false. In many places in the LXX, ὥς + *pronoun* seamlessly takes the adjectival/nominal-relative sense. The ambiguity of the Hebrew phrase אָהַבְתָּ לְרֵעֶךָ כְּמוֹךָ is not completely solved in the LXX. It seems unjustifiable to posit interpretative disambiguation on the part of the LXX-Lev translator, at least in connexion with how כְּמוֹךָ was rendered. Where there is no evidence of disambiguation in the Greek translation, it would seem most sensible to assume that the translator read and retained the original, adjectival sense of the Hebrew text. The onus is on those who read ὥς σεαυτόν in the LXX adverbially to prove their position. Indeed, ὥς σεαυτόν does eventually come to be read adverbially in the NT (see Ch.5), but the same cannot be said for the LXX. I submit that the common assumption that ὥς σεαυτόν in the LXX-Lev must be adverbial derives once again from [i] the assumption that the original Hebrew construction is adverbial and [ii] the anachronistic dependence on the adverbial sense of ὥς + *pronoun* construction found in the NT.²⁵⁶ In the

256. Barr challenges the common assumption that the Pentateuch served as a kind of “dictionary” for the translation of other LXX books. He tentatively contends, “The Pentateuch seems to me less like a dictionary which presents specific renderings, and more like a great bag of diverse resources, from which materials could be gathered up and used.” See: James Barr, “Did the Greek Pentateuch Really Serve As a Dictionary for the Translation of the Later Books?,” in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Martin F. J. Baasten et al., OLA 118

reception history of Lev 19:18 then, LXX-Lev *as produced* reveals that the translator acted as *interpretes* by refusing to solve the syntactic problem and “passing on” the ambiguity of the Hebrew text.

3.3 Lev 19:18 in the Book of Jubilees

Jubilees is a reworking of Genesis 1 through Exodus 24.²⁵⁷ Many scholars have already studied prominent themes (i.e., chronology / calendar, law observance vis-à-vis sabbath, sacrifice, festivals, purity / impurity) and the *Sitz im Leben* of Jubilees.²⁵⁸ While the love of neighbour appears to be a

(Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 523–43.

257. The only, near-complete textual remains of the book is the Ethiopic copy. VanderKam summarises the textual history of Jubilees as follows: “1. written in Hebrew; 2. translated from Hebrew into Greek and possibly into Syriac; 3. from Greek it was translated into Latin and into Ethiopic.” Corroborating manuscript evidence exists for each stage of composition, albeit some scantily so. The Qumran discovery unearthed fourteen (possibly fifteen) fragments, which confirmed the scholarly conclusion that the original composition of Jubilees was in Hebrew. James C. VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees*, Guides to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha 9 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 14.

Heinrich Ewald (1803-75) is credited with the inauguration the modern study of Jubilees, and his student August Dillmann published the first translation of Jubilees in German. The English translations and commentaries of Charles, Rabin and Wintermute have been widely used as well, but VanderKam's critical edition remains the most comprehensive and reliable one to date. Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from Jubilees in this thesis will be taken from VanderKam's critical edition. For summaries of scholarship, see: Klaus Berger, “Das Buch der Jubiläen,” *JSHRZ* 2 (1981): 285–301; John C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*, CBQMS 18 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987), 7–17; Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*, JSJSup 117 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 11–35; VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees*, 13–17; idem, “Recent Scholarship on the *Book of Jubilees*,” *CurBR* 6 (2008): 405–431.

258. Chanoch Albeck, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha* (Berlin: Bericht der Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, 1930); Berger, “Das Buch”; VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees*, 93–120.

As a reworking of the Genesis 1 to Exodus 24, narrative runs right through Jubilees. As such, narratological assessments of Jubilees have naturally been pivotal. For studies on Jubilees' scriptural settings, exegetically-based narrative technique, attempts to solve a number of interpretative incongruities and so forth, see: Robert Doran, “The Non-dating of

rather minor theme in the book, Jubilees nonetheless contains some intriguing and instructive treatment of Lev 19:18.

As is often the case, scholars diverge on both the nature and the date of the book's composition. That the author has incorporated earlier materials has never been seriously questioned, but precisely to what degree the book stands as a "unity" is still debated. The key question is whether the book is a literary work composed by a single author, which is unified in its compositional purposes, or a composite text that contains works of multiple hands (i.e., author and editor[s]) whose reshaping of the materials conflict with the original purpose(s) of the underlying material.²⁵⁹ Those who view the book as a composite work note several points of contradiction/tension and unnatural/awkward narrative sections and designate them as deriving from redactional activities.²⁶⁰ Several others—most notably VanderKam—advocate a greater degree of literary unity in the book, contending that Jubilees is a creation of a single author.²⁶¹

Jubilees: Jub 34-38; 23:14-32 in Narrative Context," *JSJ* 20 (1989): 1-11; Gary A. Anderson, "The Status of the Torah Before Sinai: The Retelling of the Bible in the Damascus Covenant and the Book of Jubilees," *DSD* 1 (1994): 1-29; David Lambert, "Last Testaments in the Book of Jubilees," *DSD* 11 (2004): 82-107; James C. VanderKam, "The Scriptural Setting of the Book of Jubilees," *DSD* 13 (2006): 61-72.

259. While signs of redaction have been noted from early on (i.e., Davenport, Wiesenberg), full-fledged redactional theories of the book have been formulated only recently by Michael Segal and James Kugel. Gene L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, StPB-JSJSup 20 (Leiden: Brill, 1971); Ernest Wiesenberg, "The Jubilees of Jubilees," *RevQ* 3 (1961): 3-40; Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*; James L. Kugel, *A Walk Through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation*, JSJSup 156 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 218-26.

260. For example, Segal and Kugel identify the original writer who wrote the *Grundschrift* of Jubilees and another "Interpolator" who later reworked the composition according to his own ideology and calendric preferences. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*; Kugel, *A Walk*, 5-16.

261. James C. VanderKam, "The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees," *JSS* 26 (1981): 209-217; idem, *Book of Jubilees*, 17-18. VanderKam's criticism of Segal's views may be found in: VanderKam, "Recent Scholarship," 414-16.

The correlative of the debate on authorship is the book's date of composition. The divergent perspectives on the nature of Jubilees' composition lead exegetes to posit different types of dating schemes. Whereas the perspective of a single authorship allows for identification of a single point for the date of composition, the advocates of a composite text can only speak in terms of compositional *stages*. No substantial difference, however, seems to exist with respect to how scholars of both camps actually date the text. While both seek the book's date of completion, the former speaks of this in terms of the author and the latter in terms of the final redactor.

The proposed dating for the book ranges approximately from 160 BCE to 100 BCE.²⁶² Charles dated the book between 109-105 BCE. This shaped the landscape of ensuing scholarly discussions for decades.²⁶³ More recently, VanderKam has posited the composition between 161-152 BCE or slightly earlier.²⁶⁴ Berger locates the text between 167-140 BCE (but asserts that it is probably between 145-140 BCE), while Segal provisionally sets the redactional stage in the Qumran milieu "following the formation of the Essene sect or stream, and it reflects the beginnings of the internal rift in the nation, which reached its full expression in the sectarian literature preserved at Qumran."²⁶⁵ Despite some uncertainties surrounding the book's compositional history, the fact that Jubilees is a Jewish composition, which emerged between Leviticus and the Gospels, and that it contains a clear,

262. Ibid., 407-9.

263. R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or The Little Genesis: Translated from Editor's Ethiopic Text and Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: A&C Black, 1902).

264. James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, HSM 14 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press for Harvard Semitic Museum, 1977); idem, *Book of Jubilees*, 21.

265. Berger, "Das Buch," 300; Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 322.

interpretative appropriation of Lev 19:18 make the book relevant for our consideration. The full formulation of Lev 19:18 אהבת לרעך כמוך is found only in Isaac's Testament, but the abbreviated version without כמוך comes into view in several other testamentary portions.

3.3.1 Jubilees' literary technique: the interweaving of Lev 19:17-18

Recently, Atar Livneh has systematically analysed allusions to and interpretations of Lev 19:17-18 that are embedded in Jubilees. Combining the observations of previous scholars, she depicts a coherent view of Jubilees' interpretation of the levitical love command. Livneh preliminarily notes that the author of Jubilees understood Lev 19:17-18, and in particular the object of love, as "referring to inter-Israelite relation" (cf. Jub 46:1).²⁶⁶ Jubilees couches the love command in exclusively familial contexts.²⁶⁷

Building mainly on the studies of Albeck and Kugel, she sets out to demonstrate how Jubilees employs a unique exegetical technique, namely, interweaving of Lev 19:17-18 into the narrative framework of the book.²⁶⁸ She

266. Atar Livneh, "'Love Your Fellow As Yourself': The Interpretation of Leviticus 19:17-18 in the Book of Jubilees," *DSD* 18 (2011): 175. Also: Albeck, *Das Buch*; Kugel, "On Hidden Hatred," 43–61.

267. Doran demonstrates several typological correlations between Abraham and Jacob, particularly the striking theme of the love Abraham has for Jacob (which is not in Genesis) as well as between Joseph and his family. Doran, "The Non-dating of Jubilees," 3–4.

268. Albeck, *Das Buch*, 35. Albeck comments, "Charakteristisch ist endlich die Stellung, welche das Gebot der Nächstenliebe in unserem Buche wie in der verwandten Literatur einnimmt. In den Testamenten der zwölf Patriarchen wird immer wieder auf dieses Gebot hingewiesen. Die 'goldene Regel' Hillels, die für ihn den Inbegriff der Thora ausmachte, wird auch in Tobit 4, 15 eingeschärft und in Aristebasbrief 207 (negativ und positiv gefaßt!) als die Lehre der Weisheit (= Thora) ausgegeben." Livneh posits that while Jubilean exegesis "shares hermeneutical elements and features with other Second Temple and later writings, such as the Damascus Document, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and Josephus' *Antiquities*," the way the author interprets the ordinances and interweaves clear allusions of Lev 19:17-18 into the Jubilean narrative framework is a feature "unattested in other writings from the period in question." Livneh, "Love Your Fellow," 176–77.

argues that while Jubilees never quotes Lev 19:17a (viz., the prohibition of hidden hatred toward one's brother), it is nevertheless clearly embedded in the command to love.²⁶⁹ Livneh's detailed analysis of the love command focusses on the exchange between [i] Noah's sons (7:15, 20, 26; 11:2), [ii] Abraham's sons (20:2, 12; 22:3), [iii] Rebecca's and Isaac's sons (Jub 35:1–38:14), [iv] Joseph's offspring (39:1–46:10). The discussion below follows her basic outline, but some observations will be added along the way.

3.3.2 Love as “what is right/just” and “peaceful coexistence”

Jubilees follows Leviticus in contrasting loving one's fellow with hating one's kinsfolk in the heart, but it also consistently joins loving one's fellow with two ideas: doing what is right/just and peaceful coexistence. For example, the first appearance of the phrase “love your fellow” is found in the testament of Noah.

[7:20] During the twenty-eighth jubilee Noah began to prescribe for his grandsons the ordinances and the commandments—every statute which he knew. He testified to his sons that they should do what is right, cover the shame of their bodies, bless the one who had created them, honor father and mother, love one another, and keep themselves from fornication, uncleanness, and from all injustice.

In prescribing ordinances and commandments to his sons (7:20), Noah asserts that “they should do what is right” and “love one another” in the same verse. The command to do “what is right” is amplified by the subsequent clauses, and mutual love is listed as one of its key aspects. The ensuing reproach in 7:26 (“...you have begun to conduct yourselves in the

269. Ibid.

way of destruction, to separate from one another, to be jealous of one another, and not to be together with one another, my sons.”) also clarifies the meaning of this phrase.²⁷⁰ Among other things, Noah’s speech connects improper conducts, which eventually terminate in the way of destruction, with three notions (7:26): [a] to separate from one another, [b] to be jealous of one another, and [c] not to be together with one another. Here, [a] and [c] reflect essentially the same idea, and Jubilees intriguingly amalgamates physical and relational distances into a single thought. Jub 7:27-28 adds the [d] “shedding of human blood” into this mix, establishing a causal relationship between the idea of “jealousy” and “shedding of human blood” (viz., murder).²⁷¹ The structure of 7:26-29 may be delineated as follows:

7:26	[x] Separation, [y] jealousy, [x'] not be together	= the way of destruction
7:27	The demonic way of destruction = shed human blood	= obliteration
7:28	Shed blood + consume blood	= obliteration
7:29	Consume blood + shed blood	= annihilation

The logic runs thus: the demonic way of destruction is fuelled by jealousy, which is made visible or which manifests itself in physical separation. This separation and jealousy eventually lead to the shedding human blood, which in consequence will lead to their obliteration. Lambert reiterates:

Separation between brothers is a “way of destruction” in that it ultimately leads to bloodshed. In this context, the commandment to love one another serves more as an attempt to prevent fraternal disunity than as a positive and general ideal of how to relate to all humanity. The interpretation of Lev. 19:18 implicit in these passages fits the original

270. Albeck, *Das Buch*, 34-35.

271. The prohibition of blood consumption is introduced in Jub 7:28, which serves as the transition between the preceding (vv.26-27) and the following (vv.29-33) units.

context of the verse.... Love is the alternative to separation, which in turn signifies destruction and ultimately bloodshed.²⁷²

Livneh also opines, "Jubilees indeed consistently presents geographical separation from one's family—an essentially non-moral act—as a negative deed indicative of disharmony within the family."²⁷³ The command to love one another in this context may then be linked to "pursue irenic familial relations."

The conceptual link between love and righteousness further narrows in Abraham's testament, which admixes yet another aspect into Jubilees' interpretation of Lev 19:18.

[20:1-2] During the forty-second jubilee, in the first year of the seventh week, Abraham summoned Ishmael and his twelve children, Isaac and his two children, and the six children of Keturah and their sons. He ordered them to keep the way of the Lord so that they would do what is right and that they should love one another; that they should be like this in every war so that they could go against each one (who was) against them; and do what is just and right on the earth.

The idea of loving one another is paralleled with the obligation to come to each other's aid in times of war in 20:2. This conceptual link is tightly enveloped by the repetition of "do what is right" and "do what is just and right." In effect, the admonition to "do what is right" and to "love one another" is expounded by the phrase "that they should be like this in every war so that they could go against each other (who was) against them."²⁷⁴ In

272. Lambert, "Last Testaments," 89, 100.

273. Livneh, "Love Your Fellow," 179.

274. While the Ethiopic text contains "war," Charles emends this to "men" here. Several others follow Charles, contending that "war" appears to be out of place here. They see this

contrast to Noah's passive love, Abraham's testament construes love as an active deed of helping each other in times of war.²⁷⁵

The bulk of the occurrences of the love command is found in Rebecca's (35:1-27) and Isaac's (36:1-19) testaments. Shortly before her death (35:27), Rebecca summons Esau and asks him "that you [i.e., Esau] and Jacob love one another, and that the one not aim at what is bad for his brother but only at loving one another" (35:20). The idea of "loving one another" sandwiches the phrase "not aim at what is bad for his brother," which reveals what is meant in Rebecca's speech.

In an earlier conversation between Rebecca and Isaac, which reveals the fear of the worrying parents, a similar and telling interplay of parallel

reading as stemming from an orthographic error. However, VanderKam evaluates and retains the present reading since the "sequel ...can be understood in a martial sense." See: James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, CSCO 510; *Scriptores Aethiopic* 87 (Louvain: Peeters, 1989), 115. Livneh and Lambert also follow VanderKam: Livneh, "Love Your Fellow," 181, n.28; Lambert, "Last Testaments," 90-91.

275. Incidentally, Lambert makes an interesting suggestion: "The 'unexpected' reference to war in Abraham's testimony may indicate that Jubilees, like some others in second temple times, understood Lev. 19:18 to indicate: 'you shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy' (Matt. 5:43)." Ibid. This could explain Jubilees' overtly inward (familial) focus, although one cannot be too certain.

Flusser contends, based primarily on later rabbinic sources, that "fear of God" and "love of God" were interchangeable during the Second Temple period. For Flusser then Abraham's exhortation in Jub 20:1-2 serves as the evidence for the presence of the Double Love Command tradition in Jubilees. Lambert follows Flusser and observes that the Jubilean author midrashically reads the phrase "to do צדקה and משפט" (Gen 18:19) as having two distinct components rather than as a hendiadys; that is, the author identifies doing "what is right" with human relations (the neighbourly love), while "what is just" relates to God and loving God. Lambert declares that Jubilees already creates "a juxtaposition [of loving the neighbour and loving God] commonly found in later second temple, early Christian, and rabbinic literature." Yet, he notes, "Given the exegetical basis of Abraham's testament, the juxtaposition of the two great commandments, occasioned by the use of both צדקה and משפט, would seem to serve more as a rubric for the organization of the commandments than as an epitome of ultimate ideals." Kugel and Meier disagree with this view. See: David Flusser, "A New Sensitivity in Judaism and the Christian Message," *HTR* 61 (1968): 107-127; Berger, "Das Buch," 425-26, XX a); Kugel, *Traditions*, 867-68; Lambert, "Last Testaments," 88-94; Meier, *Marginal Jew*, IV:506-7. Ruzer likewise advances Flusser's thesis in: Ruzer, *Mapping*, 71-99.

and antithetical ideas can be observed. Rebecca makes the following request to Isaac:

[35:9] ...make Esau swear that he will not harm Jacob and not pursue him in hatred. For you know the way Esau thinks—that he has been malicious since his youth and that he is devoid of virtue because he wishes to kill him after your death.

Esau is said to be “malicious” and “devoid of virtue” and will harm and pursue Jacob in hatred. The parents describe Esau this way because they know of his murderous intent. Isaac replies to Rebecca:

[35:15] You are saying to me that I should make him swear not to kill his brother Jacob. Even if he does swear, it will not happen. He will not do what is virtuous but rather what is evil.

Isaac is convinced that Esau will try to kill his brother in spite of their admonition. The act of murder is equated with “not do what is virtuous but rather what is evil” here, which corresponds to “hating one's brother” and “not loving him” in Jubilees. Once again, the association of “do what is right/just” = “love” and its converse, “do evil/kill” = “hate,” are plain to see. Rebecca's call to love is made as an attempt to fend off Esau's act of vengeance here rather than as a general exhortation to pursue the highest moral ideal. Following Rebecca's death (35:27), Isaac summons Esau and Jacob together and makes a request in the same vein:

[36:3-4] This is what I am ordering you, my sons: that you do what is right and just on the earth so that the Lord may bring on you everything which the Lord said that he would do for Abraham and his descendants. Practice brotherly love among yourselves, my sons, like a man who

loves himself, with each one aiming at doing what is good for his brother and at doing things together on the earth. May they love one another as themselves.

Isaac's command to "practice brotherly love" (36:4) is equated with "aiming at doing what is good for his brother" (positive intent) and "doing things together on the earth" (geographical proximity). The positive intent is doubly reinforced by the prohibition of its opposite: "One is not to desire what is bad for his brother now and forever, throughout your entire lifetime..." (36:8).

As noted earlier, one feature is unique in Isaac's testament: his is the only instance in which the command to love contains the modifier כְּמוֹד in Jubilees. VanderKam's translation (*'like a man who loves himself'*) clearly reflects the adverbial force.²⁷⁶ The adverbial rendering is once again possible, but the context prefers the adjectival sense. The command to love one's fellow appears in the literary context where familial relation between Jacob and Isaac is most decidedly underscored. Esau's response to Rebecca in 35:22-24 emphasises the uniqueness of Esau's relationship to Jacob because "I [i.e., Esau] have no brother on the entire earth but him alone. This is no great thing for me if I love him because he is my brother." Esau's promise that "my brother Jacob I will love more than all mankind," also seems to single out Jacob as *the* special person "who is like Esau" rather than the only person whom Esau would love "as he would love himself." Hence, combining these observations with the repeated emphasis on the peaceful, *familial* relation as already noted, it is more likely that the stress is placed on the object of love

276. Livneh also remarks, "An adverbial interpretation of כְּמוֹד occurs also in the interpretation of Lev 19:18 in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." Livneh, "Love Your Fellow," 189. Kugel also thinks Jubilees reflect this more universal outlook. Kugel, *Traditions*, 758.

rather than the manner by which one loves. Isaac urges that they ought to love each other because they are after all “like each other.” Isaac’s speech once again creates an ideational thread that runs: to practice brotherly love is to aim for the good of his family members; its antithesis is to have a murderous intent and to separate himself from his family.

Esau’s later remark to his sons confirms the point that in Jubilees brotherly love signifies “peaceful coexistence.” Esau insists that Isaac made him and Jacob “swear that we will not aim at what is bad, the one against his brother, and that we will continue in (a state of) mutual love and peace, each with his brother...” (37:4; cf. 37:23). Esau’s words to his sons underscore phrases like “to hate/to be an enemy” (35:9, 20; 37:18, 19), “to fight/make war” (37:6, 7, 15), and “to kill” (35:9; 37:5, 18, 24) as the opposite of love and its synonym “peace,” which bolster our argument.²⁷⁷

The reworked Joseph story reveals a similar line of thought. Even though no explicit mention of the love command can be found, Livneh argues, “[A] closer examination of the narrative reveals that this theme—and specifically the fulfillment of Lev 19:17–18—is central to the narrative.”²⁷⁸ By way of illustration, when Joseph devises a plan to test his brothers’ thoughts, he aims to discern “whether there were peaceful thoughts between them” (Jub 42:25); or, in Doran’s words, Joseph was “testing to see if they had good family relations.”²⁷⁹ The brothers pass the test “[w]hen Joseph saw that the minds of all of them were in harmony one with the other for good (ends)” (43:14). This last phrase, “to be in harmony with the other for good,” is once again “the antithesis of the expressions ‘bad things (ʿākay) in the heart’ (Jub.

277. Livneh, “Love Your Fellow,” 184.

278. Ibid., 192.

279. Doran, “The Non-dating of Jubilees,” 5–6.

37:13) and ‘was adversely inclined (’a’kaya) toward him from his heart’ (Jub. 37:24),” which is a violation of Lev 19:17a.²⁸⁰ In other words, Joseph's test was an attempt to find out whether or not his brothers were “aiming at good for one another,” that is, whether or not brotherly love existed between them.

Lastly, the fructification of Israel in Egypt (Jub 46:1-2), which appears at the end of the Joseph narrative, endorses the themes highlighted above. “Becoming numerous/populous” is clearly related to the fulfilment of the command to love as predicted by Rebecca and Isaac (35:20; 36:1ff). This positive idea sandwiches three interrelated concepts: [i] “being in harmony in their hearts,” [ii] “each loved the other,” and [iii] “each helped the other.” As noted earlier, [i] and [iii] are virtually synonymous with [ii] in Jubilees, and they together disclose the essence of Jubilean love. The obvious causal relationship between Israel's prosperity and their practice of brotherly love time and again spotlights Jubilees’ rendition of the love command.

Tabulating our observations yields the following:

	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative/Antithesis</i>
Noah: “Love your fellow: (7:20)	[i] doing right	[i] separating [ii] being jealous [iii] not being together
Abraham: “Love one another: (20:1-2)	[ii] doing right [iii] being allies	
Rebecca: “Love one another” (35:20)		[iv] aiming at what is bad
Isaac: “Practice brotherly love” (36:4)	[iv] aiming at what is good [v] doing things together	[v] desiring what is bad
Esau: Mutual love (37:4)	[vi] continue in peace	[vi] aim at what is bad
Joseph: -----	[vii] peaceful thoughts (42:25) [viii] being in harmony (43:14)	
Israelites: Each loved the other (46:1-2)	[ix] being in harmony [x] helping each other	

280. Livneh, “Love Your Fellow,” 194.

In the light of the foregoing observations, Livneh judiciously concludes:

Jubilees appears to interpret the two parts of Lev 19:17–18 in reference to two juridical functions. The Jubilean author interprets “You shall not hate your kinsman in your heart” (Lev 19:17a) as a prohibition against malicious intent, specifically the intent to murder. The fulfillment/transgression of the ordinance is indicated by the phrases “aim good/bad at one’s brother” and having “peace/bad things in the heart.” The injunction “Love your fellow as yourself” (Lev 19:18b) is understood as the act of “living together in peace” and “being an ally”—variously denoted by the terms “to love,” “peace,” “being together,” “being a brother” and “to help.” Violation of the commandment is signified by the designations “to hate,” “to be jealous,” “to fight,” “to kill,” and “to separate.”²⁸¹

To sum up, the love command in Jubilees is fused with two key motifs. On the one hand, to love is to maintain a pacificatory relationship with one’s family (viz., harmonious co-existence). Jubilees cleverly makes use of the locative language to express an aspect of love: the idea of “living together” (physical proximity) is conjoined with the idea of “living in peace”; conversely, “living separately” (physical distance) signifies “living in hostility” that will eventually precipitate murder, if left to its own devices. Jubilees hails this irenic (or merely civil) familial relation as primary. On the other hand, the more dynamic aspect of love, which is backgrounded in Jubilees, is rendered as an act of being an ally for one’s family. One must not keep the family members at an arm’s length but to fight with them in solidarity during war.

281. Livneh, “Love Your Fellow,” 198.

3.3.3 Love as covenant fulfilment

Another striking feature of the Jubilean interpretation of Lev 19:18 is the association of love with fulfilment of the covenant. For example, both Rebecca's and Isaac's testaments link the act of love with blessing, which evokes the language of covenant fulfilment. Rebecca asserts that if Jacob and Esau love each other, "Then you will be prosperous, my sons, and be honored on the earth. Your enemy will not be happy over you. You will become a blessing and an object of kindness in view of all who love you" (35:20). Endres observes:

Literarily, this series of [Rebecca's] oral admonitions matches Abraham's three testaments in Jubilees 20, 21, 22, but her exhortation has a different focus. Rather than exhorting the audience to adhere to all covenantal stipulations, Rebekah demonstrated the covenantal qualities of peace and harmony, drawing on the example of their forebears.²⁸²

A shorter blessing-curse formula also follows Isaac's charge to Jacob and Esau to love each other: "...so that you may be prosperous in everything that you do and not be destroyed" (36:8). This concise blessing is complemented by a much longer warning, which speaks of their consequences should they fail to love each other (36:9-11).²⁸³ Blessing and curse formulae are, of course, already found in the Pentateuch (Lev 26; Deut 27-28). What is unique in Jubilees, however, is the proximity between the ideas of love and of covenant fulfilment. Whereas the promises of blessing and curse in Leviticus and Deuteronomy are dependent on careful observance of the law in its entirety,

282. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation*, 175.

283. Berger, "Das Buch," 496, XXXV a).

Jubilees names Lev 19:18 as the key prerequisite for covenant fulfilment.²⁸⁴ As such, while brotherly love is not much more than one of the stipulations in Lev 19, Jubilees sets abreast the ideas of covenant fulfilment and brotherly love. Bearing in mind that [i] Lev 19:17-18 plays an important role in the Jubilean narrative and [ii] the scriptural setting of Jubilees reveals “the centrality of the covenant in his [i.e., the author’s] theological outlook,” the significance of the Jubilean link between love and covenant fulfilment can be hardly coincidental.²⁸⁵ Rebecca and Isaac’s emphasis on loving each other thus heightens the importance of Lev 19:18 in Jubilees.

3.3.4 The importance of rebuke

Given the importance of Lev 19:17-18 in Jubilees, its practical silence on the subject of rebuke is remarkable. As both Leviticus and Jubilees acknowledge the causal connection between hatred and its negative manifestations, it is surprising that Jubilees appears to place little or no emphasis on reproof.²⁸⁶ Whereas Leviticus enjoins one to openly rebuke (הוכיח)

284. The particular attention paid to the attitudinal aspect of the covenant fulfilment displays a process of abstraction, or what Flusser calls, “a new sensitivity” in Jewish thinking. By virtue of this abstraction, Jubilees elevates the love command as *the* ethical command that encompasses other stipulation.

285. VanderKam, “The Scriptural Setting,” 64–65.

286. The theme of rebuking and educating one’s children in the way of righteousness is a famous sapiential theme that is widely attested in Jewish literature from the Second Temple period. The influence of the sapiential tradition on Jubilees is hardly disputed. Proverbs treats this theme most extensively (Prov 3:12; 13:24; 22:15; 23:13-14; 29:15-17; cf. Sir 7:23-26; 30:1-13). Crenshaw notes, “The usual speakers in the Book of Proverbs are parents, both father and mother. They teach their children in the privacy of the home, although the explicit audience is restricted to boys. To shape character in the youth, parents rely on insights accumulated over years of experience by the community at large.... Such sayings need not to be argued or defended; they just are. Parents do not stop there, however, in their effort to transmit knowledge across the generations. They also use Instructions, or imperatives, in which they make strong demands on the young, at the same time reinforcing these directives with exhortations and warnings, promises and threats.” James L. Crenshaw, *Education in*

תוכיח) fellow Israelites as a remedy for vengeance-prone (נקם), ill feelings (גטר), Jubilees appears to be less concerned with curing or preventing hatred and ignores the subject of rebuke altogether. So, is rebuke altogether sidelined in Jubilees?

Contrary to Livneh's assertion that "the Jubilean author only alludes to the clauses 'You shall not hate your kinsfolk in your heart' [Lev 19:17a] and 'Love your fellow as yourself' [Lev 19:18b]," Jubilees alludes to the clause on rebuke (Lev 19:17b) as well. The command to "rebuke one's kinsfolk" is not explicitly stated,²⁸⁷ but whenever the love command appears, it is consistently embedded in the context where the patriarchs and Rebecca are rebuking (i.e., ordering, exhorting, instructing) their children. Jubilees seems to interweave the theme of rebuke into the narrative rather than ignore it. Put it differently, Jubilees *shows* rather than *tells* the importance of reproof.

Case in point, the testamentary exhortations can be construed as a form of rebuke. If the levitical demand for reproof is connected to the idea of exhorting or correcting those who are in the wrong, then the patriarchs and Rebecca do precisely that. They not only command their sons to love one another but demonstrate an aspect of it (i.e., reproof) by virtue of their

Ancient Israel: Across the Deadening Silence, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 132. For a recent volume on the topic of education in ANE, see: W. S. van Egmond and W. H. van Soldt, eds., *Theory and Practice of Knowledge Transfer: Studies in School Education in the Ancient Near East and Beyond: Papers Read at a Symposium in Leiden, 17-19 December 2008* (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut Voor Het Nabije Oosten, 2012).

287. There is, however, at least one possible allusion to the idea of rebuke in Jub 30:15 ("If one does this [give his daughter to a foreigner] or shuts his eyes to those who do impure things and who defile the Lord's sanctuary and to those who profane his holy name...") where the phrase "shutting his eyes" is probably a reference to those who fail to rebuke "those who do impure things" because of their indifference or fear. Notwithstanding, this theme is hardly explored elsewhere, and the command to rebuke or instructions on how to cure hatred are absent in Jubilees.

admonishing. For example, as Noah prescribes the ordinances and commandments (7:20), he *reproaches* his sons (7:26ff). This is certainly an act of rebuke. Abraham also “began to order them [i.e., his sons]” to do what is right (20:1-2), which once again is a form of reproof. Likewise, Rebecca’s and Isaac’s exhortations may be viewed as an act of preemptive rebuke for Esau. Although their words to Esau and Jacob are almost identical (35:25), the aim and the function of their exhortations clearly differ. For Esau, since both Rebecca (35:9-10) and Isaac (35:13-17) already “know” (predict) Esau’s intent to murder Jacob after their death, their exhortations operate as an attempt to “rebuke” (forestall) Esau of his wrath. By contrast, the exhortation for Jacob does not function as reproof, as he is deemed to have committed and will commit “no improper act” (35:6, 13). Their rebuke for Esau in the end is proved ineffective, and Esau heads to “the way of destruction” while Jacob lives on to see a happier end. The text nonetheless depicts Rebecca and Isaac as displaying love to Esau by virtue of their preemptive rebuke. Moreover, even Esau himself “rebukes” (warns) his sons not to “go and... make war with him [Jacob]” (37:3). As a number of exegetes observe, Jubilees portrays Esau in a fairly positive light in this section, especially when juxtaposed with his portrayal in Gen 27.²⁸⁸ Even though Esau’s weak character is partly to be blamed for his tragic end, Jubilees ultimately displaces the blame from Esau to his sons. Endres avers, “Jubilees portrayed Esau as a man at the mercy of pressures from others, a man struggling to adhere to his oath but tragically diverted first by his ‘sons’, then by his own dark feelings.”²⁸⁹ Prior to his ominous change of heart (37:12-13), it is precisely this act of rebuke that

288. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation*, 180–81; VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees*, 77; Kugel, *A Walk*, 175–77.

289. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation*, 180.

reveals Esau's good (albeit temporary) inner disposition. His very endeavour to dissuade his sons by means of reproof depicts Esau as a man who is desperately trying to fulfil the mandate of the Jubilean love command.

To sum up, Jubilees portrays a number of its characters in a positive light through carefully interweaving the theme of reproof. This reading is certainly likely, given the author's penchant for depicting the patriarchs in the most virtuous and exemplary light by adding praiseworthy details or omitting repulsive segments from the narrative.²⁹⁰ If there is any merit to this point, then it doubly reinforces the point that (*pace* Livneh) all of Lev 19:17-18 is skillfully interwoven into the Jubilean narrative framework. Jubilees firmly maintains the importance of reproof as an expression of love.

3.4 Conclusion

This chapter has examined the reception of Lev 19:18 in the LXX and then in Jubilees. A few conclusions may now be drawn.

Contrary to the common view, the LXX does not entirely disambiguate Lev 19:18. While LXX-Lev assigns an explicitly reflexive sense to the levitical love command, the phrase ὡς σεαυτόν is not unambiguously adverbial. Whether the love command should be construed adverbially or adjectivally is difficult to surmise, but the foregoing analysis tips the scale towards the adjectival sense. The translator of LXX-Lev seems to have been aware of the syntactical ambiguity of כַּמֹּךְ in Lev 19 but decided to render it "literally" (or leave it unsolved) with an equally ambiguous Greek construction. This is an important conclusion, as it shows that the later interpreters of Lev 19:18 did not simply read the "plain sense" of LXX-Lev

290. For a discussion of Jubilees' enhancement or degradation of its characters, see: VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees*, 109–118.

19:18, but they were themselves active participants in generating the adverbial sense.

Jubilees evidences a particularly telling interpretative development. While the tenor of the Jubilean love command remains similar to that of Leviticus, some similarities and crucial differences can be observed. First, both Leviticus and Jubilees consistently maintain that hidden hatred, that is, venomous ill-feelings, is the antithesis of love. Both texts also stress the inevitability of the outward manifestation of hidden hatred. The difference, of course, is the degree of specificity. Jubilees takes a step further in specifying or concretising the outward manifestation of hidden hatred. Whereas Leviticus does not go so far as to spell out how hidden hatred manifests itself and hence keeps the mode of its realisation somewhat open-ended, Jubilees singles out murder as *the* inescapable end of hatred. In Jubilees, to love one's brother is to live in peace with one's kinsfolk, and the primary function of Lev 19:18 is to divert the potential catastrophe of murder. The Jubilean conception of the love of neighbour is more specific and restricted compared to Leviticus.

Second, both books stress the familial ties as the primary, even the only objects of love. Although many of the episodes narrow the focus onto the characters' immediate or nucleus family members, the broader intra-Israelite relations still come into view in 46:1-2. However, the fact that the command to love the נָר is absent in Jubilees seems to indicate that Jubilee's love of neighbour has a narrower scope. Indeed, the presence of the נָר seems to be presupposed at least in some parts of the narrative (Jub 50:7), but he is never commanded to be loved.²⁹¹ The prohibition of work on Sabbath is

291. The nominal form נָר appears twice in Genesis. The first appears in 15:13 where

extended to the גר in Jubilees, much in same way it is in Exodus. But Jubilees displays virtually no concern for the גר, or at least Jubilees does not say much on the subject matter. Perhaps this owes to Jubilees's exclusive focus on familial relations. Whatever the case, in addition to the restricted meaning of love, its object is narrower in Jubilees.²⁹²

Third, while both Leviticus and Jubilees contain blessing and curse formulae, the proximity between the love of neighbour and covenant fulfilment in Jubilees is noteworthy. In Leviticus, careful observance of every stipulation of the Law is incumbent upon those who wish to fulfil the covenant. By contrast, in Jubilees, the observance of the Law is subsumed under the rubric of the love command. Without negating the importance of Torah observance, Jubilees elevates the significance of Lev 19:18, setting it shoulder to shoulder with the idea of covenant fulfilment.

YHWH predicts that Abraham's offspring will be גר in a foreign land. In the second appearance (23:4) Abraham calls himself in גר and תושב amongst the Hittites. The former is found in Jub 14:13, while the latter is omitted from Jub 19:1-15. Exodus contains nine occurrences of the term (2:22; 12:19, 48-49; 18:3; 20:10; 22:20; 23:9, 12). Besides Exod 2:22 and 18:3, which explain the etymology of the name גרשם, the גר appears in connexion with: [i] Passover/festival of unleavened bread (12:19, 48-49), [ii] Sabbath (20:10; 23:12), and [iii] the prohibition of oppression (22:20; 23:9). That the proper observance of the Sabbath law was critically important for Jubilees is well-known, and it is precisely during the discussion of Sabbath that one encounters the phrase "foreigners who reside amongst you" (Jub 50:7; contra 16:25).

292. However, Jubilees seems to exhibit a greater openness with regards to women, as the prominence of Rebecca in the book reveals. Not only does Rebecca appear on the scene when Lev 19:18 is cited, she also emerges as one of the key figures who commands the love of neighbour. On the centrality of Rebekah in the Jubilean narrative, see: Betsy Halpern-Amaru, *The Empowerment of Women in the Book of Jubilees*, JSJSup 60 (Leiden: Brill, 1999); William R. G. Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees on Sexuality: Attitudes Towards Sexuality in the Early Enoch Literature, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Book of Jubilees*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007); John C. Endres, "Revisiting the Rebekah of the Book of Jubilees" in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*, ed. Erin F. Mason et al., JSJSup 153 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), II:765-82.

Fourth, whereas Leviticus explicitly commands open reproof as the antidote of hidden hatred, the command to rebuke one's neighbour is absent in Jubilees. Nevertheless, Jubilees consistently embeds the admonition of the love of neighbour within the framework of rebuke. Whenever the patriarchs and Rebecca command their children to love each other, they do so in the form of reproof. The consistent association of these two ideas indicates that [i] Jubilees tries to portray the key characters in an exemplary light and [ii] the association of love and reproof was important in Jewish thinking at this point.

Chapter Four

Lev 19:18 in the Dead Sea Scrolls

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will study the reception of Lev 19:18 in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The scholarship on the DSS has now become a discipline, if not a number of disciplines, of its own. Its contribution to a greater understanding of Second Temple Judaism can hardly be overstated.²⁹³ This chapter will analyse pertinent passages from two major Qumran texts, namely, CD and S. While the clear citation of Lev 19:18 appears only in CD, S also clearly interprets and amplifies Lev 19:17-18, as it will be shown below.

As for the course of analysis, I will first briefly note the most recent consensus on the relationship between CD and S. Second, I will turn to the textual analysis of CD 6:11-7:4 to illuminate CD's interpretation of Lev 19:18. The absence of the latter half of the levitical love command (Lev 19:33-34) in CD will also be considered. Third, I will turn to S and argue that although S does not cite Lev 19:18b, S nonetheless reveals a careful reworking of Lev 19:18. This point will be substantiated based on three observations: [i] a high concentration of vocabulary and themes taken from 19:17-18, [ii] consistent

293. As various aspects of Qumran research are interrelated, it has become increasingly difficult to discuss any one of them in isolation without linking them to the quagmire of hypotheses. For a summary of the challenges in analysing CD, see: Jonathan G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20*, BZAW 228 (Berlin: WdG, 1995), 4-8.

rhetoical juxtaposition of love and hate, and [iii] the emphasis on practicing or refraining from rebuke as an expression of love or hate respectively. Then I will reflect briefly on the absence of גר in S as well. Lastly, I will summarise the findings and offer some concluding observations.

4.1.1 The relationship between CD and S

A survey of issues and trends in Qumranology is far beyond the scope of this study.²⁹⁴ However, one important, if vexing, question is immediately relevant to our consideration: what is the relationship between CD and S? This has been a major bone of contention in deciphering the compositional-redactional history of CD (or D-tradition) and S (or S-tradition), and more broadly the genesis and the *Sitz(e) im Leben* of the Qumran movement. A recent consensus—if one can even speak of a consensus in Qumranology—still identifies the sect(s) reflected in the Scrolls with the Essenes of the classical sources (Philo, Josephus, Pliny the Elder) but with some significant refinement.²⁹⁵ One of the important and recent trends is the move away from speaking of “the Qumran community” and associating the sect with a single, geographical motherhouse or seedbed of authority. Earlier scholarship tended to view the Qumran movement as monolithic and centralised. For instance, Vermes classically articulates, “Qumran, it seems, was the seat of

294. For attempts to give a comprehensive assessment of Qumran scholarship, see: Peter W. Flint and James VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1998-99); Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20 - 25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000). For a concise introductory work on the DSS: James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994). On current issues and trends: Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, “Introduction,” in *OHDSS*, 1–18.

295. Geza Vermes and Martin Goodman, *The Essenes according to the Classical Sources*, JSOT 1 (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1989).

the sect's hierarchy and also the centre to which all those turned who professed the allegiance to the sons of Zadok the Priests, the Keepers of the Covenant."²⁹⁶ In opposition to this earlier consensus, many now argue for the decentralisation of the movement. For instance, Hempel challenges the "Qumran-centric vantage point" from which earlier scholars had analysed the scrolls.²⁹⁷ In particular, she repudiates the simplistic and virtually exclusive association of "the Qumran sect" with Khirbet Qumran and the assumption that the sect was on the fringes of the society. Most scholars now read the DSS as reflecting various developmental stages of the movement, and some believe in the simultaneous co-existence of a number of discrete communities.²⁹⁸

296. Geza Vermes, *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: SCM Press, 1999), 113. Vermes also distinguishes between S, which "legislates for a kind of monastic society" and the states of D, which is meant for "an ordinary lay existence." Ibid., 94. Also: J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, trans. John Strugnell (London: SCM Press, 1959); Frank M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1995).

297. Charlotte Hempel, "Qumran Communities: Beyond the Fringes of Second Temple Society," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans, JSPSup 26 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 43–53.

298. Even amongst those who hold to some form of the "multiple community" theory, just how רבים, יחד and other self-designation of the communities relate to each other continues to be debated: Eyal Regev, "Between Two Sects: Differentiating the Yahad and the Damascus Covenant," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*, ed. Charlotte Hempel, STDJ 90 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 431–449; Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule*, STDJ 77 (Leiden: Brill, 2009); John J. Collins, "Sectarian Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *OHDSS*, 151–72. Wise also casts doubt on the association of the Scrolls and the site of Qumran. He locates the origins / production of the scrolls in the first century BCE. Michael O. Wise, "The Origins and History of the Teacher's Movement," in *OHDSS*, 92–122. Taylor, who comprehensively examines the Classical sources on the Essenes, maintains that the Essenes are still the best candidate for those responsible for the Scrolls. She identifies the Essenes as "a legal society or school of Second Temple Judaism from long before the second century BCE to the second century CE, alienated from the Hasmonean dynasty but much honoured by Herod and his successors. They were considered the most outstanding exemplars of Jewish piety, and were much valued for their expertise in the predictive arts." Joan E. Taylor, *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea* (Oxford: OUP, 2012), 341; idem, "The Classical Sources on the Essenes and the Scrolls Communities," in *OHDSS*, 173–99.

Whatever the precise origins and history of the Qumran movement, Schiffman's remark perhaps still represents the dominant view at least with regards to the textual affinity between CD and S:

Lest anyone suggest that the Zadokite Fragments and the Manual of Discipline have no relationship one to another, it must be noted that the common vocabulary itself, specifically the technical terminology, ought to convince us at least of the probability that the sources emanate from related circles.... The hallmark of the sectarian texts is in their approach to the derivation of the law. Both of these texts share the basic principle of Qumran legal formulation that laws are derived from Scripture by a process of inspired biblical exegesis which took place in regularly occurring session. Further, and perhaps most important, only when the testimony of the two documents is studied at the many points at which they share common detail, can we begin to understand either text. Thus, we are led to the conclusion that despite the somewhat different intentions of the two texts, as well as the different socio-communal background of each, they do, in fact, make up the complementary pieces of one puzzle.²⁹⁹

While scholars rightly criticise the tendency of earlier scholarship to over-harmonise CD and S (and all the Scrolls for that matter), most nonetheless still acknowledge that CD and S “emanate from *related* circles” (emphasis mine). The fact that CD and S share many ideas and that they exhibit signs of complex dependence on each other remains widely accepted, especially in view of the more recent analyses of the Cave 4 material.³⁰⁰

299. Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony, and the Penal Code*, BJS 33 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 11–12.

300. The real point of contention is the extent and the nature of such dependence, and which (if either) reveals awareness of the other source. Kapfer and Schofield hypothesise the development of S based on D, while Regev and Kruse defends the chronological priority of S over CD. Kratz recently contends for the chronological precedence of the Penal Code of S over CD. Following his conclusion Steudel also theorises the essential literary dependence of CD on S. She considers CD as a *Fortschreibung* of S, with the exception of 1QS VII-IX, which

In any event, the primary concern of this chapter is neither the origins nor the identification of the communities reflected in CD and in S. However, in view of the recent move towards seeing the Qumran movement as a much more diverse and widely dispersed, even mainstream, Jewish tradition in the Second Temple society, I will proceed with the assumption that CD and S refer to related but distinct communities (or stages of communities), and each text will be studied separately.

4.2 Lev 19:18 in the Damascus Document

The modern study of CD has now marked a century of ongoing research. CD consists of two mediaeval manuscripts: [i] MS-A (tenth century), which contains sixteen pages (= CD 1-16), and [ii] MS-B (twelfth century), which contains two pages (= CD 19-20) and partially overlaps with MS-A.³⁰¹ A number of related fragments were also found at Qumran, which

was added by a redactor of S as a reaction against D. S's textual enlargement then triggers yet another expansion of CD (VI,11-VII,6 par XIX,1-2; CD X,4-XII,20). Collin G. Kruse, "Community Functionaries in the Rule of the Community and the Damascus Document: A Test of Chronological Relationships," *RevQ* 10 (1981): 543-51; John J. Collins, "The Yahad and 'The Qumran Community'," in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*, ed. Charlotte Hempel et al., JSJSup 111 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 81-96; Hilary Evans Kapfer, "The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule: Attitudes toward the Temple as a Test Case," *DSD* 14 (2007): 152-77; Eyal Regev, "Cherchez les femmes: Were the Yahad Celibate?," *DSD* 15 (2008): 253-84; idem, "Between Two Sects," 431-449; Schofield, *From Qumran*; Charlotte Hempel, "Shared Traditions: Points of Contact between S and D," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*, ed. Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller, STDJ 92 (Leiden: Brill, 2010); Reinhard G. Kratz, "Der Penal Code und das Verhältnis von Serekh ha-Yachad (S) und Damaskusschrift (D)," *RevQ* 98 (2011): 199-227; Annette Steudel, "The Damascus Document (D) as Rewriting of the Community Rule (S)," *RevQ* 100 (2012): 605-20.

301. The standard numbering of pages and lines follows that of Schechter: S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries: Edited from Hebrew Mss. in the Cairo Genizah Collection Now in the Possession of the University Library, Cambridge*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: CUP, 1910). For a concise and valuable survey of scholarship from Schechter until 1982, see: Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document,"* JSOTSup 25 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 3-47. For more recent contributions, see: Steven E. Fassberg, "The

confirmed the antiquity of the D-tradition. Most came from Cave 4, but a few fragments were also found in Cave 5 and Cave 6. Eight 4QD documents brought to the limelight the largely legal nature of the D-composition.³⁰² Since Schechter's initial publication in 1910, many of the analyses have focused on linguistic and source-critical analysis of CD and on ascertaining the identity of the sect—all in keeping with the quintessential modus operandi of the historical-critical approach. Most scholars note numerous underlying sources and/or redactional strata on the assumption that CD is a composite work.³⁰³ Although no consensus on the detailed segmentation of the text exists, most exegetes nevertheless divide CD into two major sections: [i] Admonition (CD 1-8 [MS-A], 19-20 [MS-B]) and [ii] Law (CD 9-16 [MS-A]).³⁰⁴ The citation of Lev 19:18 appears in CD 6:20-21 (CD MS-A), which is also contained in 4QD^d (4Q269) and 6QD (6Q15). Even though these Qumran

Linguistic Study of the Damascus Document: A Historical Perspective," in *Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998*, ed. Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick, STDJ 34 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 53-67.

302. The Law portion of CD had not been carefully analysed until fairly recently, as earlier scholarship was focused on Admonition. For a brief overview of the Law section, see: Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*; Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law*, SJLA 24 (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 3-12; Charlotte Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition, and Redaction*, STDJ 29 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 8-14; Thomas R. Blanton, *Constructing a New Covenant: Discursive Strategies in the Damascus Document and Second Corinthians*, WUNT 2/233 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 17-24.

303. The recent publication of Wacholder goes directly against the grain of this scholarly assumption. Wacholder incorporates all the available evidence from both Cairo Geniza and Qumran in his reconstruction and argues for a much greater degree of literary unity in CD. He thinks the analysis of CD, "especially of the newly found fragments, shows that the text goes back to a single author." Ben Zion Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document: The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary*, STDJ 56 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 9-11.

304. Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Laws of the Damascus Document in Current Research," in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, ed. Magen Broshi (Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 57.

fragments are indeed fragmentary, they are nonetheless orthographically congruent with the Cairo Geniza manuscripts.³⁰⁵ Only a minor, if any, text-critical issue exists that would affect the present analysis. Whatever the historical reality reflected behind each compositional stage of the document, most scholars agree that the section within which the love command occurs forms a literary unity, which may very well have come from a single source. The first task then is to clarify the contextual meaning and the function of Lev 19:18 in CD.

4.2.1 CD 6:11b-7:4a

CD (MS-A) 6:11b-7:6a³⁰⁶

וכל אשר הובאו בברית	11
לבלתי בוא אל המקדש להאיר מזבחו חנם ויהיו מסגירי	12
הדלת אשר אמר אל מי בכם יסגור דלתו ולא תאירו מזבחי	13
חנם אם לא ישמרו לעשות כפרוש התורה לקץ הרשע ולהבדל	14

305. Just how CD MS-A, MS-B and all the Qumran fragments ought to be collated and restored remains uncertain. For analyses of the manuscripts, proposed reconstructions and the date(s) of composition, see: Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*; Joseph M. Baumgarten, ed., *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)*, DJD XVIII (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); Hartmut Stegemann, "Towards Physical Reconstructions of the Qumran Damascus Document Scrolls," in Baumgarten, Chazon, and Pinnick, *Damascus Document*, 177–200; Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*; Blanton, *Constructing*, 17–24; Campbell, *The Use*; J Mark Boyce, "The Poetry of the Damascus Document" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1988).

306. Cf. 4Q266 [4QD^a] 3.2:17-25, 3.3:4-6; 4Q269 [4QD^d] 4.2. Joseph M. Baumgarten et al., "Damascus Document 4Q266-273 (4QD^{a-h})," in *Damascus Document Fragments, Some Works of the Torah, and Related Documents*, vol. 3 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: WJKP, 2006), 24-27, 110-11. Also: Baumgarten, DJD XVIII (1996). Unless otherwise indicated, the text and the translation of CD are from: Joseph M. Baumgarten and Daniel R. Schwartz, "Damascus Document (CD)," in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*, vol.2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr; Louisville: WJKP, 1995), 4-57. See, also: Broshi, *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, 20. For full-fledged reconstructions of CD, see: Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*; Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol.1 (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-zvi Press, 2010), 1-58 [Hebrew].

מבני השחת ולהנזר מהון הרשעה הטמא בנדר ובחרם	15
ובהון המקדש ולגזול את עניי עמו להיות אלמ[נו]ת שללם	16
ואת יתומים ירצחו ולהבדיל בין הטמא לטהור ולהודיע בין	17
הקודש לחול ולשמור את יום השבת כפרושה ואת המועדות	18
ואת יום התענית כמצאת באי הברית החדשה בארץ דמשק	19
להרים את הקדשים כפירושיהם לאהוב איש את אחיהו	20
כמהו ולהחזיק ביד עני ואביון וגר ולדרוש איש את שלום	21

אחיהו ולא ימעל איש בשאר בשרו להזיר מן הזונות	1
כמשפט להוכיח איש את אחיהו כמצוה ולא לנטור	2
מיום ליום ולהבדל מכל הטמאות כמשפטם ולא ישקץ	3
איש את רוח קדשיו כאשר הבדיל אל להם כל המתהלכים	4
באלה בתמים קדש על פי כל יסורו ברית אל נאמנות להם	5
לחיותם אלף דור...	6

- [6:11] ... And all who were brought into the covenant (are)
[12] not to enter the sanctuary to light his altar in vain, (but rather are) to be “closers of
[13] the door” of whom God said “Who of you will close my door and not light my altar
[14] in vain?”—unless they take care to perform according to the exact (requirements of) the
Torah during the time of evil and to separate (themselves)
[15] from the sons of the pit and to refrain from the wicked wealth (which is) impure due to
oath(s) and dedication(s)
[16] and to (being) the wealth of the sanctuary, (for) they (the sons of the pit) steal from the
poor of his people, preying upon wid[ow]s
[17] and murdering orphans—and to distinguish between the impure and the pure and
make known (the difference) between
[18] the holy and the profane, and to observe the Sabbath day in its exact detail, and the
appointed times
[19] and the day of the fast as it was found by those who entered into the new covenant in
the land of Damascus,
[20] to offer up the holy things in accordance with their detailed requirements, to love each
man his brother
[21] as himself, to support the poor, destitute, and proselyte, and to seek each man the peace
of
[7:1] his brother. And let no man trespass with regard to his near kin; (rather, let him) stay
away from unchastity
[2] in accordance with the precept; let each man rebuke his brother in accordance with the
ordinance and not keep a grudge
[3] from one day to the next. And let him separate himself from all impurities, according to
their precept; and let no man defile
[4] his holy spirit as God distinguished for them. All those who walk
[5] in these perfect holiness (and) are governed according to all (these things), God’s
covenant is an assurance to them
[6a] to bring them life for a thousand generation(s).

Virtually all exegetes sense a disjunction at CD 6:11. Knibb's words represent the common perception: "The abruptness of the transition in line 11 suggests that a new section begins at this point."³⁰⁷ Stegemann designates 6:11-7:4a as *Gemeinderegel*, 7:4b-6 as *Segensformel* and 7:9b-13b as *Gerichtsdrohung*, with a couple of interpolations in this section.³⁰⁸ Similarly, Murphy-O'Connor sees 6:11b-8:3a (again, with interpolations at 7:6b-8, 13c-8:1a) as a single literary unit, which he calls, "Memorandum."³⁰⁹ Davies designates the injunctions of 6:11b-7:10a as, "Main points of the community's halachah."³¹⁰ Campbell alternatively proposes 6:11b-7:9a as a unit.³¹¹ Wacholder puts the headings as "Those who shun the Temple on account of its defilement" (6:11b-14a) and "A digest of the sectarian Torah" (6:14b-7:6a).³¹² Despite the diverging opinions regarding the unit's endpoint, most agree on the following broad structural-thematic division:

6:11b-14a	Heading: members/initiates of the new covenant
6:14b-20a	First set of injunctions: relationship with outsiders
6:14b	Separation from the sons of pit
6:20b-7:1	Second set of injunctions: relationship with insiders
7:2-4a	Separation from impurity
7:4b-6a	Closing: promise of blessing/curse

307. Michael A Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, Cambridge Commentary on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World: 200 BC to AD 200 (Cambridge: CUP, 1987), 50.

308. Hartmut Stegemann, "Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde" (PhD diss., University of Bonn, 1971), 165.

309. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "Translation of Damascus Document VI, 11-14," *RevQ* 7 (1971): 553-56.

310. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 125.

311. Campbell, *The Use*, 134-37.

312. Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 224.

4.2.1.1 The heading (CD 6:11b-14)

The section 6:11b-14a is both syntactically and notionally difficult. Just how one construes the syntax of these lines depends largely on what one makes of הברית החדשה. Two interrelated points should be considered in connexion with this phrase: the nature and the degree of separation from the Jerusalem Temple and the meaning of the phrase בארץ דמשק.³¹³

Several scholars maintain that the sect sought total separation from the Temple. Those who advocate this view tend to construe CD 6:11-14 as mandating physical and literal separation from the Temple. For instance, Murphy-O'Connor observes a semantic distinction between ברית used as a "covenant" elsewhere (e.g., CD 6:19 באי הברית החדשה) and the meaning intended here in 6:11. He adopts Lévi's earlier proposal and connects וכל אשר

313. Three main interpretations regarding the term "the land of Damascus" have been put forward: [i] a city or region in Syria, [ii] Qumran, and [iii] Babylon. The most common and straightforward understanding is [i], which takes the term as a geographical reference to a place in Syria. The other two options take Damascus as a coded word, which figuratively refers to either Qumran (Cross) or Babylon (Murphy-O'Connor, Iwry, Rabinowitz, Davies, Hultgren). Cross's construal puts the formation of the sect around the mid-second century BCE while Murphy-O'Connor's scenario puts it as early as the sixth century BCE. See: Isaac Rabinowitz, "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments," *JBL* 73 (1954): 11–35; Samuel Iwry, "Was There a Migration to Damascus? The Problem of Shevi Israel," in vol. 9 of *Eretz-Israel: W. F. Albright Volume*, ed. Abraham Malamat (Jerusalem: Jerusalem Exploration Society, 1969), 80–88; Murphy-O'Connor, "Translation," 553–56; Cross, *The Ancient Library*, 72–73; Philip R. Davies, "The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where Is 'Damascus'?", *RevQ* 14 (1990): 503–19; Stephen J. Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 66 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 116–21. For a summary of these views and a refutation of Cross's and Murphy-O'Connor's arguments, see: Blanton, *Constructing*, 79–86; Adam S. van der Woude, "Fifty Years of Qumran Research," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. Peter W. Flint and James VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1998), I:28–35; Roland Bergmeier, *Die Qumran-Essener-Hypothese: Die Handschriftenfunde bei Khirbet Qumran, ihr spezifischer Trägerkreis und die essenische Gemeinschaftsbewegung*, Biblisch-theologische Studien 133 (Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener Theologie, 2013).

לבלתי בוא to the immediately following phrase הובאו בברית.³¹⁴ For Murphy-O'Connor then, ברית of 6:11 does not refer to the New Covenant that the community entered but a pact or an agreement *not* to do something: “*all those who were persuaded to enter into an agreement not to enter the sanctuary.*”³¹⁵ He takes both the paraphrase of (6:12) and the quotation of Mal 1:10 (מי בכם יסגור) as retaining the original sense, which endorses physical separation from the Temple. Likewise, Wacholder, who thinks Damascus is a literal geographical reference, takes the subject of the אם לא clause (6:14) to be the Jerusalem authorities who fail to observe the Torah properly.³¹⁶ These scholars read CD 6:11-14 as a self-contained unit or a heading, which sanctions abandoning Jerusalem altogether.³¹⁷

On the contrary, others argue that CD does not stipulate a physical retreat from the Temple but a transfer of allegiance. Those who hold this view understand CD 6:11-14 as prohibiting *improper* access to the Temple. Unlike the Jerusalem authorities who fail to follow the Torah appropriately, the members of the New Covenant are taught with פרוש (“*exact detail / requirement*”) the proper perspective with which they are to view and to access the Temple.³¹⁸ Davies rightly reasons, concurring with Stegemann and

314. Israël Lévi, “Un écrit sadducéen antérieur à la destruction du temple,” *REJ* 61 (1911), 161–205.

315. Murphy-O'Connor, “Translation,” 556.

316. Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 223. Nebe posits that the paraphrase of Mal 1:10 was absent in the original text. He thinks the secondary insertion of the paraphrase of Mal 1:10 causes the structure of CD 6:11-14 to appear confused. He proposes that וכל אשר הובאו בברית forms the protasis of a conditional sentence and ויהיו מסגרי הדלת its apodosis. Wilhelm G. Nebe, “Nocheinmal zu Text und Übersetzung von CD VI, 11-14,” *RevQ* 16 (1993), 285–87. Also, Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant*, 116–18.

317. Murphy-O'Connor, “Translation”; Nebe, “Nocheinmal zu Text”; Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 222–3.

318. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran*, 57–74; Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 134–42; Goodman also argues against physical separation from the Temple. Martin Goodman, “Religious Variety and the Temple in the Late Second Temple Period and Its Aftermath,” *JJS*

Baumgarten, that total separation from the Temple was unlikely, given how frequently CD spells out the way in which the members ought to relate to the Temple (e.g., CD 6:20; 11:17-23; 12:1-2). The **אם לא** clause (6:14) then stipulates that the Covenanters are not to enter the Temple *unless* they meticulously observe CD's פרוש.³¹⁹ What follows the heading then are two sets of injunctions that delineate precisely how the Covenanters ought to behave when they enter the Temple.

Regardless of whether a physical exodus from Jerusalem or only a transfer of allegiance to the New Covenant without physically breaking away is in view here, the heading (CD 6:11-14) stresses the idea of “proper separation” (הבדל) from the outsider. The heading orientates the reader towards the proper interpretation of the ensuing injunctions. A number of infinitive verbs are strung together in 6:11b-7:4 to give a sense of formal uniformity, and the two sets of injunctions are thematically flanked by the principle of proper division (6:14; 7:3-4), which nicely creates an *inclusio*.³²⁰

60 (2009), 202-13; idem, “Constructing Ancient Judaism from the Scrolls,” in *OHDSS*, 81-91. For an assessment of Goodman’s view, see: Timothy H. Lim, *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*, AYBRL (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), 23-25.

319. Baumgarten and Schwartz propose a similar translation: Baumgarten and Schwartz, “Damascus Document (CD),” 22-23.

Davies contends that only 6:11 (וכל אשר הובאו בברית) should be read as the heading and that ויהיו מסגירי הדלת אשר אמר אל מי בכם יסגור דלתו ולא תאירו מזבחי חנם is a secondary interpolation that amplifies 6:12 (להאיר מזבחי חנם). For Davies, CD 6:12 is the first of the enumerated injunctions attached to the heading (6:11) that spells out how the Covenanters ought to relate to the Temple. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 134-40; idem, “The ‘Damascus’ Sect and Judaism,” in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. John C. Reeves et al., JSOTSup 184 (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1994) 70-84.

320. Stegemann, “Die Entstehung,” 225; Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 134.

4.2.1.2 The first set of injunctions (CD 6:14-20)

[A] 6:14 - to separate from the sons of the pit (6:14)

[A'] 6:15 - to refrain from the wicked wealth (6:15)

[Rationale for A/A'] for they

[i] steal from the poor of his people (v. 16)

[ii] prey upon widows (v. 16), and

[iii] murder orphans (v. 17)

[B] 6:17 - to distinguish between the impure and the pure

[B'] 6:17 - to make known between holy and the profane

[Explication of B/B']

[i] observe the Sabbath day

כפרושה (v. 18)

[ii] the appointed time and the day of fast בראי הברית החדשה (v. 19)

[iii] to offer up the holy things כפירושיהם (v. 20)

The first set of injunctions consists of two parallel clauses that are followed by three supporting clauses. Davies observes, "The first [set of injunctions] concerns relations with outsiders, the second relations with insiders."³²¹ CD 6:14-20 deals with two major issues. The A/A' pair stresses the need for proper separation from בני החשת ('the sons of the pit').³²² The initiates are to dissociate themselves from בני החשת who pursue and possess the wicked and defiled wealth. CD 6:16-17 spells out the seriousness of the wicked's offence for oppressing the weak. This highly polemical characterisation of the wicked is expanded in CD 8:2-12a where CD recounts (and/or, perhaps predicts?) the deserter of the Covenant. CD 8:4b-9 denounces the ones who

321. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 126–27. Campbell also classifies non-consecutively the list into three areas: [i] "commands regarding separation" (five commands from 6:14ff., 15; 7:1, 3ff.), [ii] "cultic instructions" (four commands from 6:17ff., 18ff., 20), and [iii] "rules concerning conduct and relations with neighbours" (five commands from 6:16ff., 20ff., 21; 7:1, 2,3). Campbell, *The Use*, 136.

322. For a recent, orthographical evaluation of the phrase בני החשת in CD, see: C. Stroup, "A Reexamination of the 'Sons of the Pit' in CD 13:14," *DSD* 18 (2011), 45–53.

have turned to or failed to desist from the way of the traitors as שרי יהודה ('the princes of Judah'):³²³

CD (MS-A) 8:4b-9³²⁴

כל מורדים מאשר לא סרו מדרך	4
בוגדים ויתגוללו בדרכי זונות ובהון רשעה ונקום וניטור	5
איש לאחיו ושנוא איש את רעהו ויתעלמו איש בשאר בשרו	6
ויגשו לזמה ויתגברו להין ולבצע ויעשו איש הישר בעיניו	7
ויבחרו איש בשרירות לבו ולא נזרו מעם ויפרעו ביד רמה	8
ללכת בדרך רשעים ...	9

[8:4] ... All (are) rebels because they did not depart from the way of
 [5] traitors, but rather wallowed in the ways of prostitutes and wicked wealth, avenging and bearing grudges
 [6] each man against his brother, and each hating his neighbor; and each ignored the relation of his flesh.
 [7] And they drew near (one to another) for incest, and they strove mightily for wealth and profit and each man did what was right in his own eyes
 [8] And each chose according to the wantonness of his heart, and did not remove himself from (the) people. And they arrogantly become unruly,
 [9] walking in the way of the wicked ones ...

Shemesh points out that the characterisation of שרי יהודה in CD 8:2b-12a is clearly meant to highlight the antithesis between the righteous (the Covenanters) and the wicked (the Sons of the pit).³²⁵ The wicked are

323. CD-A and CD-B overlap here. O. J. R. Schwarz has recognised the essential priority of CD-A, observing that all the textual variants of CD-B can be solved by positing its dependence on CD-A. Murphy-O'Connor considers six substantive differences between CD-A and CD-B and concludes that A represents the original text. Ottilie Johanna Renata Schwarz, *Der erste Teil der Damaskusschrift und das Alte Testament* (Diest: Lichtland, 1965); Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "Critique of the Princes of Judah: CD 8:3-19," *RB* 79 (1972): 200–205.

324. See the parallel passage in MS-B 19:17-21a; cf. 4Q266 3:4. Most scholars agree that this section is an interpolation. Precisely to whom the title "Prince of Judah" refers is debated. Murphy-O'Connor thinks it is a generic term that is synonymous with another equally generic term "the wicked." The closest parallel to this acrimonious demurral is found in the prophetic criticisms against the Israelite elite (i.e., Amos 2:6-7), and he argues that this reference is made to the ruling class in Judah. *Ibid.*, 206–12.

325. Aharon Shemesh, "Scriptural Interpretations in the Damascus Document and Their

described as such here precisely because they flout the injunctions that the initiates are taught to uphold. CD creates a striking contrast by using a number of identical terminologies and thematic antitheses:

The Covenanters (C) ≠ The Wicked (W)

C: refrain from wicked wealth/impurities (6:15b; 7:1)

≠ W: wallow in prostitution/wicked wealth (8:5a)

C: rebuke one another; not keep a grudge (7:2-3a)

≠ W: avenge/bear grudges against his brother (8:5a-6a)

C: love each man his brother (6:20b)

≠ W: each hates his neighbour (8:6b)

C: no trespass with near kin; avoid unchastity (7:1b)

≠ W: ignore relation of flesh; draw near for incest (8:6b-7a)

C: support and seek well-being of brother (6:21-7:1a)

≠ W: strive for profit; do what is right in their eyes (8:7b)

C: separate from the sons of the pit (6:14b-15a)

≠ W: do not remove themselves from the people (8:8b)

Returning to CD 6:11b-7:4, the B/B' pair (6:17) continues the language of separation, but the focus shifts to cultic matters. CD 6:18-20 once again insists that the Covenanters ought to follow the exact requirement (פרוש) of the

Parallels in Rabbinic Midrash," in Baumgarten, Chazon, and Pinnick, *Damascus Document*, 164. Shemesh summarises: "The initiate undertakes to love his brother as himself, while the wicked hate their brothers; the former undertakes to support the poor, the destitute, and the proselyte, while the traitor wallows in ill-gained wealth and strive for riches, doing what is right in his or her own eyes. The same applies to the duty to rebuke one's fellow and to refrain from revenge, in contrast to the wicked who seek revenge and bear grudges." Ibid.

Torah as they were found (במצאת) by those who entered into the New Covenant in the land of Damascus (CD 6:19).

4.2.1.3 The second set of injunctions (CD 6:20-7:4)

6:20	Heading: Love each man his brother as himself	
6:21	[a] support the poor, destitute and proselyte	[a] Positive + [a'] Positive
	[a'] seek the peace of his brother	= Parallel
7:1	[b] not trespass with regard to his near kin	[b] Negative + [b'] Positive
	[b'] stay away from unchastity כמשפט	= Contrastive
7:2	[c] rebuke his brother כמצוה	[c] Positive + [c'] Negative
	[c'] not keep a grudge	= Contrastive
7:3-4	[d] separate from all impurities כמשפטם	[d] Positive + [d'] Negative
	[d'] not defile his holy spirit	= Contrastive
	<d/d' Rationale> as God distinguished for them	

CD 6:20 begins, if abruptly, a new section. A clear thematic shift can be detected at this point, and the focus turns inward to the internal relations between the Covenanters. In contrast to the first set where פרוש and כמצאת modify the injunctions of vv.18-19, the second set is defined twice by משפט and once by מצוה. CD 6:20b seems to function as another heading that governs the ensuing injunctions of CD 6:21-7:4a.³²⁶ The command to love one's brother (לאהוב איש את אחיהו כמהו) is clearly drawn from Lev 19:18, although the syntax is slightly altered. CD employs the infinitival form of אהב with איש as its subject, converts רעה to אח and the prefixed-ל on רעך to את, and switches the suffixes on אח and כמו from the second (ך-) to the third

326. Davies and Wacholder also read 6:20b as a heading, or an introductory clause, that governs the second set of injunctions. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 131; Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 230.

person (הוּ). This grammatical tweaking can be easily explained on stylistic grounds (i.e., subject agreement).³²⁷

That CD is citing Lev 19:18 in this section can be demonstrated by the cluster of other references from Leviticus (mostly from H) that are interwoven into CD 6:17-7:3. Murphy-O'Connor identifies the following:³²⁸

<u>CD</u>	<u>Leviticus</u>
Distinguish between pure/impure (6:17; cf. 10:10; 12:19-20)	= 10:10; 20:25
Observe Sabbath (6:18; cf. 10:14-11:18)	= 23:3
Keep the appointed feasts/Day of Fasting (6:19)	= 23:4ff., 27ff.
Offer up/set aside holy things (6:20a)	= 22:2
Love one's brother (6:20b)	= 19:18
Succour the poor/needy (6:21b; cf. 14:14-15)	= 19:9-10, 34
Seek the brother's well-being (6:21c)	= 19:17
Prohibition of incest (7:1a)	= 25:25ff. (also, chs.18, 20)
Refrain from unchastity (7:1b)	= (18:6ff.)
Reprove the brother (7:2; cf. 9:2-8)	= 19:17-18
Keep away from all uncleanness (7:3; cf. 12:11ff.)	= 20:25

Given the density of references and allusions to Leviticus and the finesse with which levitical laws are interwoven into CD 6:17-7:3, there is no doubt that CD 6:20b is a reworking of Lev 19:18.³²⁹

At this juncture, one must note that the construction of *suffix* + בְּמוֹ is once again ambiguous. Both the adverbial and the adjectival/nominal-relative renderings are once again possible. בְּמֵהוּ could be construed as

327. The addition of אִישׁ as the subject, however, may have been an attempt to emphasise the distributive sense, viz., every single person in the community, to the command.

328. In addition, וְלִגְזוֹל in CD 6:16 also belongs to this list, as it is probably an allusion to Lev 19:13b (תִּגְזֹל). While CD 6:16 may be an exposition of Isa 58, the prohibition of oppressing those who are poor and vulnerable in the community neatly corresponds to the thrust of Lev 19 as well. Schenker, "Das Gebot," 244-48.

329. Campbell, agreeing with Davies, opines, "While some of this [scriptural allusion and references] may best be described as a superficial web of biblical language..., we may intuitively suspect a more developed and deliberate use of scripture than scholars have hitherto reckoned with...." Campbell, *The Use*, 9-10.

modifying **לאהב**, or it could be read as modifying **אחיהו**, which would follow the original sense of Lev 19:18. A good reason to render **כמהו** adverbially is the appearance of similar phrases that use the **כ** + *noun* construction in this section:

CD 6:20b	כמהו	איש את אחיהו	לאהוב
CD 7:2	כמצוה	איש את אחיהו	להוכיח
CD 7:3	כמשפטם	מכל הטמאות	ולהבדל

That both **כמצוה** in 7:2 and **כמשפטם** in 7:3 are functioning adverbially (*‘in the manner of/according to מצוה / משפטם’*) seems straightforward, and the formal likeness of 6:20b to 7:3 and particularly to 7:2 (infinitive + **כ** + **איש את אחיהו**) strengthens the case for the adverbial rendering. However, two points may be advanced in favour of the adjectival/nominal-relative option. First, 6:20b is not identical with 7:2 or 7:3, and **כמהו** is the only one in which a pronominal suffix is attached to **כמו** / **ב**. CD 6:20b is the only one in which the pronounced, formal similitude between **כמהו** and the immediately preceding phrase **אחיהו** can be observed. Moreover, **כמהו** is placed even farther away from the verb **אהב** in CD 6:20-21 than in Lev 19:18, which makes the adverbial rendering of **כמהו** rather odd. Second, given the intense focus on differentiating the insider from the outsider in CD 6:11-7:4, it makes more sense to emphasise the object (i.e., the brother who likewise was brought into the New Covenant) rather than the manner of love (i.e., love him as you would love yourself). Although these arguments are not definitive, CD 6:20-21 seems to retain the adjectival force of Lev 19:18.

In any event, the love command in CD 6:20b has a summative function much in the same way the love command in Lev 19 does. Their

structural arrangements, however, differ. Whereas Leviticus places the love command at the end of a section to sum up what precedes (Lev 19:11-18a), CD puts it as a heading for what follows. The string of infinitive verbs that are used to generate a sense of formal coherence in CD 6:11b-7:4a looks analogous to the string of לֹא + imperfect verbs employed in Lev 19:11-18 (see Ch.2). It is also no accident that the love command in CD 6:11b-7:4 governs the sections that are concerned with intra-communal relations. The meaning of CD 6:20b is immediately amplified by two interrelated notions: to support the weak and the vulnerable and to seek the wellbeing of one's brother. The act of supporting and providing for the needy is basic to fulfilling the love command. The urge to seek the well-being of one's brother elucidates the inner disposition out of which one must act. The Covenanters are to do exactly the opposite of what the Wicked of the preceding lines do, that is, they rob and take advantage of the vulnerable (CD 6:16-17).³³⁰ The second set of injunctions employs a catchphrase (עֲנִי וְאֲבִיּוֹן וְגֵר) analogous to the one found in Deuteronomy and elsewhere ([גֵר + יְתוֹם + אֵלְמָנָה] + עֲנִי) that designates the socially disadvantaged and the vulnerable (cf. Deut 10:18-19; 24:17; Jer 22:3; Ezek 22:7; Zech 7:10). CD commands that each person should love the brother who is like himself *by* succouring the afflicted, the orphans, and the גֵר, *which means* to seek actively their wellbeing.³³¹

330. The blank space between 6:21a and 6:21b in CD MS-A may seem to imply a disjunction at this point. Broshi, *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, 20. But, the syntactical and thematic similarity between the clauses of 6:21a and of 6:21b suggests that they should be construed as a unit.

331. Interestingly, CD not only prohibits the oppression of the socially disadvantaged, it also makes tangible provisions for the deprived group. CD stipulates that each member's wages of at least two days per month should be withheld for the purpose of caring for the underprivileged (CD 14:12-17). Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 230.

CD 6:21 is especially closely linked to 6:20b. Apart from the close conceptual-thematic semblance, the syntactical structure of 6:20b (לאהוב איש את אחיהו כמהו) and of 6:21b (ולדרוש איש את שלום אחיהו) are strikingly similar, and they together tightly envelope the phrase עני ואביון וגר. CD 6:21 is also the only pair among the second set of injunctions that does not contain the phrase “according to משפט/מצוה.” Moreover, while both the positive (*‘you must’*) and the negative (*‘you must not’*) components are mixed together in all the other sets, 6:21 is the lone line where two positive clauses are used to create a parallel set. CD 6:20-21 clearly designates the גר as a brother who is the object of love and care of the community. One may note the distinct objects of love that are enumerated formulaically in these lines.

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| x) 6:20b | לאהוב איש את אחיהו כמהו
'to love each man his brother as himself, |
| 6:21a | ולחזיק ביד עני ואביון וגר
to support the poor, destitute, and proselyte, |
| x') 6:21b | ולדרוש איש את שלום אחיהו
and to seek each man the peace of his brother'. |

The way that the two occurrences of אחיהו in 6:20 and 6:21 sandwich עני ואביון וגר is very telling. It highlights the following conceptual equation: + עני + אביון + גר = אחיהו. After posing the command to love one's brother, the text immediately reminds the reader of the fellow brothers who are most easily neglected. The logic thus runs: אחיהו equals “members of the New Covenant” (CD 6:11), which equals the עני, the אביון and the גר. The גר is to be loved and cared for by the community as its own, and in return the גר is to keep all of the injunctions of CD 6:11-7:4, just as all the other members do. The reappearance of the גר in CD 14:3-6, which defines precisely who is allowed

to participate in the meeting of “the Many,” corroborates the insider status of the גר in CD.

CD (MS-A) 14:3-6³³²

וסרך מושב כל המחנות יפקדו כלם בשמותיהם הכהנים לראשונה	3
והלויים שנים ובני ישראל שלשתם והגר רביע ויכתבו בשמותיהם	4
איש אחר אחיהו הכהנים לראשונה והלויים שנים ובני ישראל	5
שלשתם והגר רביע וכן ישבו וכן ישאלו לכל והכהן אשר יפקד	6

- [3] The rule for the settlement of all the camps: They shall all be mustered by their names; the priests first,
 [4] the Levites second, and the sons of Israel third, and the proselyte(s) fourth. And they shall be inscribed by their names,
 [5] one after the other, the priests first, the Levites second, the sons of Israel
 [6] third, and the proselyte(s) fourth. Thus shall they sit and thus shall they inquire about any (matter). And the priest who is appointed to preside over...

In CD 14:3-6 the גר is listed as the fourth member after the priests, the Levites, and the sons of Israel.³³³ CD 14:5 unmistakably treats the גר as a brother, as the phrase איש אחר אחיהו indicates.

Furthermore, CD 14:12-17 discusses how to meet the community's social needs, but the גר is not listed as one of the members in need.

Wacholder thinks that “their [i.e. גרים] numbers were not significant enough to warrant their placement in the legislation....”³³⁴ Gillihan, who thinks the גר

332. Cf. 4Q267 [4QDb] 9.5; 4Q268 [4QDc] 2. Curiously, 4Q267 9.5:8 (cf. CD 14:4) lacks the reference to the גר, although he appears soon after in 9.5:10. Baumgarten et al., “Damascus Document 4Q266-273,” 98-99, 106-7. Hempel lists three possible explanations for the lack of reference to the גר at 4Q267 9.5:8 ([i] accidental omission, [ii] the absence and the presence of the גר in 4Q267 reflect two different, social realities, [iii] the intentional omission by the redactor/scribe), and she deems [iii] to be least likely. Hempel, *The Laws*, 134. Moreover, a similar list is found in 4QLots (4Q279) 5:2-6. See: P. Alexander and G. Vermes, eds., *Qumran Cave 4. XIX. Serekh Ha-Yahad and Related Texts, DJD XXVI* (Oxford: OUP, 1998).

333. Considering that women and children were explicitly named in a similar list of Deut 29:9-10, it is remarkable that only the גר is explicitly listed here.

334. Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 231-32.

in CD was fictional, would think this omission confirms his hypothesis that the גר is fictitious.³³⁵ While these proposals are possible, they are not necessary in order to make sense of the text. The text's logic becomes apparent if one considers the two different vantage points that CD assumes in speaking of its members. In fact, the גר is not the only taxonomical category absent from the list of CD 14:12-17—*none* of the categories mentioned in CD 14:3-6 is listed in CD 14:12-17. The absence of גר in CD

335. Gillihan submits that the גר in the sectarian writings only serves a literary-theological purpose and reflects no real-life, socio-religious group within the community(-ies). Yonder M. Gillihan, "The גר Who Wasn't There: Fictional Aliens in the Damascus Rule," *RevQ* 98 (2011): 257–306. Whereas Berthelot (whose study Gillihan takes as the point of departure) and others appeal to diachronic layers within sectarian writings to explain the presence of conflicting attitudes towards the גר, Gillihan takes a synchronic approach, meaning he believes the writings from Qumran share a common view regarding the גר. Katell Berthelot, "La notion de גר dans les textes de Qumrân," *RevQ* 19 (1999): 171–216. In his article, Gillihan sets out to solve the "contradiction" between the clearly positive portrayal of the גר, viz., a legitimate member included in the New Covenant, in CD and their exclusion from the restored temple, viz., their innately profane status over and against זרע ישראל, in 4QFlorilegium and the like. He examines CD, 4QLots (4Q279), 4QpNahum, 4QMMT, 4QFlorilegium, SE (1QSa), and War Rule (1QM) and concludes: "Perhaps they [i.e., גרים] are not proselytes. After all, the Covenanters seem to have rejected the possibility of real Gentile conversion: they will be banished from eschatological Israel. They may not marry sectarians and, contrary to the Temple Scroll, Scripture, and rabbinic thought, they may not worship at the temple, nor, we should suspect, in the sect's cultic activities.... Perhaps they are rhetorical and legal fictions. I do not think they are converts in the rabbinic sense, but simply resident aliens idealized along the lines of Scripture.... I propose that the Covenanters imagined the 'true' גר to be a righteous Gentile who accepted his eschatological exclusion from Israel." Gillihan, "The גר Who Wasn't There," 301-2. As interesting Gillihan's synchronic reading is, he unduly harmonises the Qumran texts and relies too heavily on the assumption that the concept of genealogical impurity, which is argued by Hayes, prohibited gentile conversion. In the light of the recent discussion on diversity within Judaism(s) and the move away from harmonising the DSS, his approach evades, rather than engages with, the issue. Moreover, if only synchronic reading of DSS were in view, then the historical conclusion he draws (viz., that no גר actually existed) seems extraneous to his study. He aims to show that varying attitudes towards the גר found in the Qumran writings can be synthesised, if one considers the particularly positive portrayal of the גר in CD as fictional and the more negative view expounded elsewhere as the commonly held view. But, one could just as easily imagine the reverse scenario: the negative portrayal of גר is polemical and fictional, while the positive portrayal of גר is more historically substantive. Either way, his conclusion is unconvincing.

14:12-17 then may better be explained by the fact that CD is employing two different kinds of taxonomical frameworks at this point.³³⁶ To wit, CD categorises the members of the community from a *lineal/genealogical perspective* (i.e., priests, Levites, sons of Israel, and the גר versus everyone else) in 14:3-6 while it classifies them from a *socio-economic perspective* in 14:12-18. These perspectives may be adumbrated as follows:

Perspective I: lineal classification (CD 14:3-6)

Insider	= [i] הכוהנים, [ii] הלויים, [iii] בני ישראל, [iv] גר
Outsider	= Not [i] or [ii] or [iii] or [iv]

Perspective II: socio-economic (sub)classification (CD 14:12b-18)

a) פצעם	e) אשר ישבה לגוי נכר
b) עני ואביון	f) בתולה אשר אין לה גואל
c) זקן אשר יכרע	g) נער אשר אין לו דורש
d) איש אשר ינוגע	

These two perspectives are not mutually exclusive, but rather the latter is a subcategory of the former.³³⁷ All those classified under the socio-economic taxonomy certainly have a place in the lineal classification as well. CD 14:3-6 views the גר from the lineal perspective where the גר is counted as a legitimate, albeit lower, member.³³⁸ Although the גר may still be in need and

336. Given the fact that people simultaneously occupy multiple social spheres (i.e. gender, nationality, socio-economic class, religion, occupation, state of health), the way in which an individual is identified depends on which framework of social classification is in view. On this point, see: Martin Goodman, *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*, Wilde Lectures in Natural and Comparative Religion (Oxford: OUP, 1995), 12–13.

337. Certain restrictions, of course, apply, and the latter perspective is not meant to be comprehensive. For instance, the priest cannot be a virgin without a redeemer or have physical defects according to Lev 21.

338. Jokiranta independently reaches a similar conclusion: Jutta Jokiranta,

occupy one of the subcategories of CD14:12-18, the same undoubtedly holds true for others in CD 14:3-6.³³⁹

Returning to CD 6:20-7:4, three contrastive sets of commands are tagged on to the heading. CD 7:1 prohibits the sin of incest.³⁴⁰ CD 7:2 commands the Covenanters to rebuke each other and not to harbour a grudge, which is once again taken from Lev 19:17-18. This theme of rebuke is picked up again in CD 9:2-8a, which evidences a particular and fascinating understanding of this levitical mandate:

CD 9:2-8a (cf. 5Q12 [5QD])

ואשר אמר לא תקום ולא תטור את בני עמך וכל איש מביאו	2
הברית אשר יביא על רעהו דבר אשר לא בהוכח לפני עדים	3

"Conceptualising *Ger* in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaesus*, ed. Kristin De Troyer et al., CBET 72 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 674-75.

339. Berthelot makes a similar observation: Berthelot, "La notion," 173-75. This phenomenon is all the more curious, given that the *גר* is genealogically distinct from the rest of the insiders. If lineage were the prime communal boundary marker, then the *גר* would fit much better in the "outsider" category. Yet, this is precisely not the case. The sustained effort of CD to include the *גר* in its legislation—crystallised in the command to love him—suggests that lineage was not the only or even the primary boundary marker in CD.

340. In light of CD 5:7-11, CD 8:4-8 and some rabbinic parallels, Shemesh proposes that the "prostitution" (הזנות) here refers specifically to marriage with one's niece. He contends, following Ginzberg, that CD 8:4b-10a is a midrash on Isa 58:7. He envisages a scenario in which the wicked was ignoring this particular restriction on marriage, thereby committing the grave sin of incest. He adduces the baraita (b. Yeb 62b), a rabbinic midrash also on Isa 58:7, which appears to be aware of the one who "marries his sister's daughter." He concludes, "The Sages were presumably aware that the members of the sect interpreted the verse in this way and for that very reason offered an alternative exposition with the opposite conclusion, in keeping with rabbinic halakah...." Shemesh, "Scriptural Interpretations," 163-67. However, Hempel rightly warns (about a different passage in CD, but her point still holds true here), "Because of the strong biblical orientation of the halakhah stratum ... we have to exercise caution in attempts to use the material from the halakhah stratum as a window into the life of the community in as much as particular practices or terms may be derived from scripture rather than express present-day realities." Hempel, *The Laws*, 36-37. It is noteworthy that the topic of incest appears in close proximity to the love command in CD much in the same way the topic of incest (Lev 18; 20) appears close to the love command (Lev 19) in Leviticus.

והביאו בחרון אפו או ספר לזקניו להבזותו נוקם הוא ונוטר	4
ואין כתוב כי אם נוקם הוא לצריו ונוטר הוא לאויביו	5
אם החריש לו מיום ליום ובחרון אפו בו דבר בו בדבר מות	6
ענה בו יען אשר לא הקים את מצות אל אשר אמר לו הוכח	7
תוכיח את רעיך ולא תשא עליו חטא ...	8

- [9:2] And as to that which he said, "You shall not take vengeance nor keep a grudge against the sons of your people," any one of those who enter
- [3] the covenant who brings a charge against his neighbor without reproof before witnesses,
- [4] but brings it in his burning wrath or tells it to his elders to put him to shame, is taking vengeance and bearing a grudge,
- [5] It is written only, "He takes vengeance against his adversaries and keeps a grudge against his enemies."
- [6] If he was silent from day to day and in his burning wrath charged him with a capital offense,
- [7] his iniquity is up on him, for he did not fulfill the ordinance of God which says to him, "You shall surely
- [8] reprove your neighbor so that you do not bear sin because of him." ...

CD 9:2-8a amplifies and develops the requirement of reproof, which is only briefly noted in CD 7:2, with a number of concrete directives. Hempel proposes the following outline for 9:2-8a:³⁴¹

B. 9,2a Scriptural Citation, paraphrase, or explicit reference

a) Introductory formula

b) Citation of Lev. 19,18

C. 9,2b-4 Halakhic exposition

Basic form: כל איש...אשר

B. 9,5 Scriptural Citation, paraphrase, or explicit reference

a) Introductory formula

b) Citation of Nah. 1,2

C. 9,6-7a Halakhic exposition

Basic form: כל איש...אשר clause continuing the basic form

B. 9,7b-8a Scriptural Citation, paraphrase, or explicit reference

341. Hempel, *The Laws*, 32–33; also, Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 7–19. CD 13:18 also contrasts love with holding a grudge, but MS-A is badly damaged here.

- a) Introductory formula
- b) Citation of Lev. 19,17

The structure here is unique. While all the surrounding sections either begin/end with or simply cite scriptural verses, CD 9:2-8 is flanked by two partial citations of Lev 19:17-18. CD 9:2b-4 designates that when a Covenanter (X) **בחרון אפו** brings a charge against his fellow (Y) without first properly reproaching him (Y) before witnesses (**לפני עדים**), then the litigator (X) is guilty of **ונוטר נוקם**. Schiffman observes that CD 9:2-8 (along with 1QS 6:1) requires witnesses (other than those who saw the offense) to be present when someone is reproached. These texts deal “not with a simple moral obligation ... but with a forensic procedure which must be executed in accord with specific legal norms.”³⁴² CD then cites the second scriptural verse, Nah 1:2, to complement the first citation of Lev 19:18a. CD 9:6-7a spells out the procedure of reproof on a capital matter (**מוות דבר**).³⁴³ The syntax of the phrase **בו ענה** on line 7 is unclear. Most scholars attempt to understand the Geniza reading as it stands, proposing only a minor, if any, emendation. For instance, Schechter, followed by Baumgarten and Charlesworth, proposes the emendation from **ענה** to **עון**, making **עון** the subject of the clause and the

342. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 94–95. Also, see: Kugel, “On Hidden Hatred,” 53–54; Bilhah Nitzan, “The Laws of Reproof in 4QBerakhot (4Q286–290) in Light of Their Parallels in the Damascus Covenant and Other Texts from Qumran,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies*, Cambridge, 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten, ed. Moshe J. Bernstein et al., STDJ 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 149–65; Charlotte Hempel, “Who Rebukes in 4Q477?,” *RevQ* 6 (1995): 655–56.

343. As Wacholder observes, CD 9:6-7 may have drawn on Deut 19:16. Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 321. The transition into the matter of capital offense seems abrupt and puzzled many analysts. Schiffman takes note of Ginzberg's clever construal: “According to him [Ginzberg], *even if it be a capital crime, the accuser is liable. In other words, the text has singled out the ‘worst case’ as an example.*” Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 92.

object of the accused (*'his sin is upon him'*).³⁴⁴ Rabin retains the reading and designates the accuser as the subject of ענה and בו, translating, "it was in a capital matter that he testified against him."³⁴⁵ Martínez and Tigchelaar take the phrase as the accuser testifying against himself (*'he [the accuser] has testified against himself'*), while Cook regards the accuser himself as the object of the verbs but makes sin the subject (*'this testifies against him'*). Despite their differences, all these readings similarly assume that the phrase בו ענה refers to the accuser and/or his sin. By contrast, Wacholder considers the Geniza rendition to be problematic. Considering a number of additions found in the Qumran fragments against the biblical background (cf. Deut 19:18-19), he proposes the following reconstruction:³⁴⁶

אם החריש לו מיום ליום ומחודש לחודש ובחרות אפו בו דבר בו	9:6
בדבר מות יומת הנוקם שקר ענה בו אם דבר כן ודבר בלוא	9:6a
שני עדים	9:6a
והיו השופטים אמת להמיתו	9:6b
והשופטים יהיו נקאים כי שקר	9:6c
ענה בו יען אשר לא הקים את מצות אשר אמר לוא הוכח	9:7
תוכיח את רעידך ולא תשא עליו חטא ...	9:8

"And, if he was silent from day to day [or] month to month, but when he ignited his against him (the accused) he charged him with a capital offense, [the avenger shall be put to death. He has testified falsely against him. If] he has asserted thusly, sa[ying so without the testimony of two witnesses, the judges] shall be [faith]ful [by condemning him to death... and the judges shall be] absolved [since falsely] he has testified against him, for he has not upheld the commandments of God. (This is the meaning when) it says concerning him, 'You shall surely reprove your neighbour so that you shall not bear sin on account of him' (19:17)."

344. Schechter, *Documents*, 1:xlvi. While Schechter's emendation is attractive particularly in the light of 1QS 6:1, 4Q270 Fg6.3:20-21 (4QD^e) supports the more difficult ענה reading.

345. Chaim Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents: I. The Admonition. II. The Laws* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), 44.

346. Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 84-85.

Wacholder agrees with other scholars in taking ענה and בו as references to the accuser and the accused respectively, but his interpretation tries to stress the key concern of the passage, that is, the integrity of השופטים.³⁴⁷ Whatever the precise sense of this passage, it is evident that CD contains a tradition that has refined the role of reproof. Reproof has become formalised as a legal procedure. Schiffman summarises:

Lev. 19:18 has been interpreted here to mean that a member who sees an offense must immediately perform the required “reproof”. If he does not, but later makes an accusation, he violates Lev. 19:18 by “bearing a grudge” without having first fulfilled this “reproof” before witnesses does so out of anger or to defame the accused among the members of the sect. ...the reproof must be offered in love and kindness, not in anger or in a complaining tone. In other words, it is not enough to fulfill the letter of the requirements as to time, witnesses, etc., but the spirit in which the reproof is offered is also important.³⁴⁸

Circling back to the discussion of CD 6:20b-7:4a, 7:2b-3a thus is a concise précis of CD’s view on reproof, which is subsequently amplified in 9:2-8a. The fact that such a précis itself is tagged onto the love command (the heading) suggests the heightened importance of Lev 19:18 in CD.

347. Wacholder avers: “What appears to emerge from this additional wordage is that the author of MTA presented here a case of what happens if the accuser, being a single witness, charged a capital offense against an individual without bringing legal proof. If the charges were determined to be a falsification manufactured by the accuser, he was to be condemned to death in accordance with Deut 19:18-19. ...the assumption that the accused shall be condemned would logically follow the clause in CD 9:6.... The author’s concern for the integrity of the judges is conceivably a polemic against the sages who would not condemn a single witness, since such testimony in their view would have no legal standing.” Ibid., 322-23. As thoughtful and intriguing as Wacholder’s proposal is, it obviously rests on extensive and subjective reconstructions.

348. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 89, 94.

Finally, CD 7:3-4 ([d / d'] above) continues the language of separation, although in this set what the members ought to separate from is the impurities of “unloving” attitudes and behaviours. The reappearance of הַבְּדִל at 7:4 envelopes the commands between 6:14 and 7:4. The initiates are to separate from all kinds of uncleanness so that the presence of the Holy Spirit may not be diminished.³⁴⁹ The flip-side of the positive aspect of love is its negative aspect, which enjoins one to fence out everything that has the power to defile him. These two aspects of love are held tightly together in CD. As noted earlier, the precise endpoint of this literary unit is disputed, but the blessing formula of CD 7:4-6 certainly draws this section to a close. The blank space in 7:6 and another thematic shift at 7:6b supports this understanding.

To sum up, the meaning of the love command in CD relates specifically to these ideas: [i] to seek actively the welfare of the disadvantaged members by providing for them, [ii] to refrain from transgressing the familial boundaries as delineated by the law, [iii] to rebuke the fellow Covenanters openly and “legally” so as to not store up ill-feelings, and [iv] to separate oneself from all impurities, which include but are not limited to cultic and ethical domains.³⁵⁰

4.2.2 The brother גַּר in CD

One more important consideration remains. Leviticus takes pains to create a twofold love command by using nearly identical phraseology in Lev

349. Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 233.

350. These reflect a careful reading of Leviticus: [i] is an important topic in Leviticus (i.e., Lev 19:9-10); [ii] addresses the issue of incest, which is also the topic of Lev 18 and 20; [iii] is the immediate antithesis of the love command in Lev 19:18b, and [iv] speaks of the idea of separation, which is also fundamental to Leviticus (i.e., 10:10, 20:24-26).

What does CD do with the love of the גר? At first glance, Lev 19:34 seems to be absent in CD, and it is indeed true that the quotation of Lev 19:34 is not found in CD. However, CD carefully incorporates Lev 19:33-34 into its composition. Rather than ignoring Lev 19:34 altogether, CD thoughtfully distills the two-fold, levitical love command into a single formulation at CD 6:20-21.³⁵¹ Case in point, as aforementioned, CD 6:20-21 clearly designates the גר as אחיהו. In doing so, CD also reverses the negative command of Lev 19:33b (לא תונו אותו) into two positive commands in CD 6:21 (ולדרוש את שלום) (ולאהחזיק ביד...)³⁵² Whereas to love the גר in the context of Lev 19:33-34 only specifically relates to refraining from oppressing and taking advantage of the גר, CD 6:21 goes beyond this and commands the love of the brother to encompass helping the brother גר actively and seeking his well-being.³⁵³ To

353. If CD views its members mainly from a lineal-genealogical perspective, then why is

be sure, the fact that CD still uses the term גר shows that the גר still constituted a distinct genealogical-taxonomical category. This is in continuity with the earlier priestly usages, but the priestly texts never allowed the distinction between the גר and the אזרח to meld. By contrast, CD sets in motion a major paradigm shift. CD abolishes the paradigmatic juxtaposition of בני ישראל or אה as true insiders over and against the גר who is a *quasi-member* in the community. CD no longer treats the גר as the antithesis of the true insider. This once-crucial, priestly distinction between the neighbour (insider) and the גר (pseudo-insider/outsider) is merged and rendered obsolete in CD. It is not that the גר altogether disappeared from the community but that the ambiguous category of גר as a *foreign yet pseudo-Israelite* had disappeared. CD recasts the “in-between” status of גר as a brother who is to be loved and cared for by the community as a true insider and a full member. The “omission” of Lev 19:34 then is actually not an omission at all, but rather it is a distillation of the two levitical love commands into a single formulation. CD takes another step towards reinforcing Leviticus’ call in 19:34: to consider the גר as someone “who is like you” (כמוד).

the גר still grouped with אבין and עני in CD 6:21? This seems to result from CD’s integrative interpretation (or midrashic exposition) of Lev 19:18, 19:33-34, and Deut 24:14-15. See: Akiyama, “The גר.” The familiar deuteronomic (and to a lesser extent priestly; cf. Lev 19:10, 33) depiction of the גר rhetorically reinforces the prophetic axiom that the true measure of love is seen in how one treats the most easily neglected in the community. The catchphrase must have retained a tremendous rhetorical value that CD made use of it in melding Lev 19:18 and 19:34 together.

4.2.3 Interim summary

Three conclusions regarding CD's reception of Lev 19:18 may now be drawn. First, the love command in CD consists of the positive and negative aspects that pertain to one's dispositional ("seek/will to") and practical ("act/provide") dimensions. To love is not only to desire the well-being of the fellow Covenanter but also to aid the disadvantaged, to refrain from transgressing various boundaries delineated by the Law, and to rebuke each in full accordance with the community's legal stipulations. Second, CD's elaboration on reproof, or the adaptation of reproof as a legal procedure, is best explained as CD's interpretative amplification of Lev 19:17-18. While Leviticus remains vague about the details surrounding how one should go about rebuking the brother, CD prescribes the procedure through which this command can be implemented. In short, CD "legalises" reproof. This great concern for reproof seems to stem from the desire to follow faithfully the levitical mandate. The fact that the citations of Lev 19:18 (the love of neighbour) and 19:17 (call for reproof), along with many other references to Leviticus, are concentrated in CD shows its deep concern for applying levitical laws to the community.

Third, the meaning of the גר is shifting (or, has shifted) in CD. CD extends the use of the love command as a formal heading to undergird a number of ethical demands. In doing so, CD distils the two, discrete parts of the levitical love command (Lev 19:18b, Lev 19:34) into a single formulation, thereby broadening the meaning of אחיהו. The גר remains to be a real taxonomical category, yet the antithesis of the גר is no longer the Israelite but those who are outside of the New Covenant. Although the גר occupies the lower end of the communal hierarchy, CD treats the גר as an insider, a

brother who is to be loved and a full member who participates in the session of “the Many.”

CD’s integrative tendency is remarkable but not particularly surprising. CD 7:6b-9a speaks about those who lived in ערים (the “urban” type) and those who lived in מְחֻנּוֹת (the “monastic” type, which probably included the site of Khirbet Qumran).³⁵⁴ Since little is known about the everyday practices of the Covenanters, just how much social and relational distance the urban Covenanters desired or maintained from other urban dwellers (viz., the outsider) is difficult to surmise.³⁵⁵ However, given the ethnic and religious diversity of the ancient Graeco-Roman cities, the urban Covenanters must have had some, if not regular, social exchange with outsiders (though they may have viewed this as less-than-ideal). One can easily imagine a scenario in which the Qumran movement attracted some

354. Several exegetes consider 7:6a-9 to be an interpolation, but Davies and Wacholder disagree. Davies thinks that 7:6a-9a addresses those who were born in these camps: “The burden of this fragment is that a child whose parent is a member of the community—a state of affairs which can occur in the ‘camps’— shall also be subject to the laws of the community.” Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 142; idem, “The ‘Damascus’ Sect,” 76–77. Cross also seems to think that marriage was restricted to “some of the ‘camps’.” Cross, *The Ancient Library*, 71. Contra Davies, Wacholder holds that “family life was not an option for the campers as Davies implies.” CD divides the community into “city dwellers and campers,” and the city dwellers were to remain celibate (=separate and pure vis-à-vis the outsiders) while “the campers were commanded to marry and procreate as was the custom when Israel camped in the wilderness.” Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 236–37. At any rate, if the editor of CD felt it necessary to include different stipulations that were specifically tailored to city and camp dwellers, then the distinction between these types of Covenanters must have been operative at some point in the Qumran movement.

355. The majority view still associates the Qumran movement with the Essenes. For the Essene hypothesis, see: Cross, *The Ancient Library*, 66–71; Stegemann, “Die Entstehung”; Davies, “The Birthplace,” 505; Taylor, “The Classical Sources,” 173–99; John J. Collins, *The “Dead Sea Scrolls”: A Biography* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 33–66. For a dissenting view, see: Norman Golb, “Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls?,” *Biblical Archaeologist* 48 (1985): 68–82. For an illuminating treatment of the idea of “sectarian” writings, see: Carol A. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*, ed. William H. Propp, Baruch Halpern, and David Noel Freedman, BJSUCS 1 (Warsaw, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–87.

outsiders who wanted to join them, perhaps as גרים. Different communal structures allow room for the existence of the גר in at least some of them.

Finally, the interpretative and summary function of Lev 19:18 is patently on the rise. Lev 19:18 is used as the heading that regulates the relationship between the Covenanters, which the ensuing injunctions of CD 6:21-7:4 amplify.³⁵⁶ The love command is still limited to the realm of ethical or neighbourly duty in CD and thus not the hermeneutical key through which all scripture is to be read. Nevertheless, CD elevates the importance of Lev 19:18 as an “anchor” in scriptural interpretation.

4.3 Lev 19:18 in the Community Rule?

S has been hailed as one of most important manuscripts found at Qumran. In addition to the substantial length and the good state of manuscript preservation of 1QS, its highly developed theology and rules have drawn much scholarly interest.³⁵⁷ Since S does not explicitly quote Lev

356. If Ginzberg and Shemesh are right in seeing CD 6:20b-7:1 as an exposition of Isa 58:7 where Lev 19:18 is used to develop the idea pregnant in Isa 58:7, then this point is strengthened even more.

357. The textual history of S is yet to reach a consensus, but virtually all scholars now hold that S is a composite text. 1QS, which is paleographically dated from 100 BCE to 75 BCE, used to be equated with S, but such an assumption is considered no longer tenable. Metso contends, “Although the title, ‘Community Rule’ has established itself in the field of Qumran studies, in discussing the group of manuscripts designated with the letter S we are actually dealing with a varied collection of texts representing several literary genres, originating at different times and deriving from different sources.” Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, STDJ 21 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 1; idem, *The Serekh Texts* (London: T&T Clark International, 2007). Alexander also notes, “Their [i.e., Serekh texts] agreements in wording, content and order prove that they contain the same basic document. Their divergences suggest that that document, over the course of time, underwent extensive editing and change.” Philip S. Alexander, “The Redaction-History of Serekh ha-Yahad: A Proposal,” *RevQ* 17 (1996-97): 437. As such, 1QS is now understood as only a recension of S; nevertheless, as 1QS is by far the most extensive and well preserved

19:18, the inclusion of S in this section needs to be justified. S is included here because S evidences a particular interpretation of Lev 19:18, which is very similar to that of CD. While S avoids citing Lev 19:18, S's great concern for reproof and the highly evocative and constructive use of the language of love and hate suggest that S is interpretatively applying Lev 19:17-18 into the composition.³⁵⁸ As a document related to CD, S can serve either to corroborate or to call into question the foregoing conclusions on CD.

version, most studies of S are based on or rely heavily on 1QS. For a "searchable, fast-loading, high-resolution" image of 1QS, visit: <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/community>.

Studies of the related 4QS texts made a better understanding of the textual history of S possible. S-related fragments found in Cave 4 include: 4Q255-264, 4Q275 (4QCommunal Ceremony) and 4Q279 (4QLots). They are all palaeographically dated between 125 BCE to 50 CE by Cross, and the oldest one among these derives from the end of the second century BCE (4QS255). Hence, the initial redaction of S is thought to have begun around the middle of the second century BCE. See: Alexander and Vermes, *DJD XXVI* (1998); James H. Charlesworth, Elisha Qimron, and Frank M. Cross, "Cave IV Fragments," in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr; Louisville: WJKP, 1994), 53-57; James H. Charlesworth and Brent A. Strawn, "Reflections on the Text of Serek Ha-Yahad Found in Cave IV," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 403-35.

Alexander, who relies heavily on Cross's palaeographical analysis, thinks 1QS is older than the 4QS material on palaeographical and text-critical grounds. Alexander, "The Redaction-History," 437-565. Garnet is, for the most part, in agreement with Alexander: Paul Garnet, "Cave 4 MS Parallels to 1QS 5:1-7," *JSP* 15 (1997): 67-78. Metso, on the contrary, thinks the "original version (O)" of the Community Rule contained the shorter version of 1QS V-IX, which was initially redacted by two different lines of traditions (as represented in 4QS^e and 4QS^{b, d} respectively) before the redactor of 1QS (or its predecessor) compiled and combined these traditions into what is now known as 1QS. Metso, *Textual Development*, 143-49. Vermes also contends that "1QS is more likely to be an expanded edition of the Cave 4 texts rather than 4QS an abridgement of 1QS," based mainly on terminological differences (i.e., reference to "the sons of Zadok" in 1QS). Geza Vermes, "Preliminary Remarks on Unpublished Fragments of the Community Rule from Qumran Cave 4," *JJS* 42 (1991): 255. Bockmuehl takes a similar line of reasoning: Markus Bockmuehl, "Redaction and Ideology in the Rule of the Community (1QS/4QS)," *RevQ* 18 (1998): 541-60. For a recent survey on the works on the redaction of S, see: Schofield, *From Qumran*, 2-6.

358. Ruzer argues that 1QS evidences an interpretative tradition surrounding Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18, which conforms to the Jewish exegetical pattern of this period. Ruzer, *Mapping*, 82-86.

4.3.1 Love and hate in S

The root אהב appears twelve times in S.³⁵⁹ Much like its usage in the HB, אהב is characteristically juxtaposed with שנא. The first of these occurs in the well-known preamble (1QS 1:1-15). Charlesworth observes that the preamble consists of a string of twenty-two infinitive constructs, which are all prefixed with the ל of purpose and state the motivation behind the composition of S.³⁶⁰ Amongst these purpose clauses, one finds a bold assertion in 1QS 1:3-4: ולאהוב כול אשר בחר ולשנוא את כול אשר מאס (*'and in order to love all that he has chosen, and to hate all that he has rejected'*).³⁶¹ S establishes a close link between the ideas of loving the chosen and hating the rejected. Another set of parallel phrases in 1QS 1:9b-11a firmly fixes this conceptual equation in the reader's mind: ולאהוב כול בני אור איש כגורלו בעצת אל ולשנוא כול בני חושך איש כאשמתו בנקמת אל (*'and in order to love all the Sons of Light each according to his lot in the Council of God, and to hate all the Sons of Darkness each according to his guilt at the vengeance of God'*). Moreover, 1QS 9:16 admonishes each member of the Yaḥad to establish both אהבתו עם שנאתו (*'his love with his hatred'*), which is repeated in the summary statement of 9:21a.³⁶² In S, love

359. Of these occurrences one designates God as the subject (1QS 3:26) but the rest designate the Covenanters. In 1QS verbal forms are found in 1:3, 9; 3:26 and nominal forms in 2:24; 5:4, 25; 8:2; 9:21; 10:26. Most occurrences of the nominal form appear in the phrase, אהבת חסד. A similar lexical collocation can be found in Micah 6:8, but אהבת חסד as a set phrase only occurs here. S. Heinz-Josef Fabry, "אהב 'āhab,'" *ThWQ* I:66.

360. James H. Charlesworth and Elisha Qimron, "Rule of the Community (1QS; Cf. 4QS MSS^{A-J}, 5Q11)," in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr; Louisville: WJKP, 1994), 7.

361. Cf. 4QS MS A, Frg. 1 = 1QS1:1-5. Unless otherwise indicated, all Hebrew quotation and English translation of S will be taken from: *Ibid.*, 1-51.

362. Mermelstein argues that love and hate "reinforced a hierarchical worldview, in which the sectarians stood at the peak of the divine order by virtue of divine love." Ari Mermelstein, "Love and Hate at Qumran: The Social Construction of Sectarian Emotion,"

and hate are two sides of a single coin.³⁶³ In view of this unvarnished, double emphasis on love and hate, S divides the entire world into only two types of people: [i] those chosen by God and [ii] those rejected by God.³⁶⁴ The objects of love and hate are inseparably married to this dualistic outlook, and this stark dualism forms the characteristic insider-outsider demarcation in S.

For all the emphasis on pursuing this righteous hatred, however, S makes an intriguing, if counter-intuitive, demand. The members of the Yaḥad are to hate the Sons of the Pit; yet, the members are not to retaliate against, harm or even argue with them. For instance, 1QS 9:16b-17a states that one must not reprove (להוכיח) or quarrel with (ולהתרויב) the Sons of the Pit but to leave them just as they are. While such a pacifistic and non-judgmental stance may appear to be more consonant with the act of love rather than that of hate, the ensuing phrase reveals the true intent behind the principle of S's pacifism: ולסתר את עצת התורה ('so as to conceal the Council of Torah') from them.³⁶⁵ If one rebuked the Sons of the Pit, one may unwittingly

DSD 20 (2013): 258.

363. Mermelstein stresses the importance of the role of the language of emotions in shaping the sectarian identity and thinking. She employs a social constructionist approach in her analysis and argues, "Love of insiders and hate of outsiders were not simply the products of a tight-knit community estranged from the outside world. Rather, love and hate served as vehicles for *constructing* and *embracing* the group's distinctive worldview, according to which only the sect enjoyed a covenantal relationship with God. Divine love and hate, as we will see, were presented as the basis for the relative positions of sectarians and non-sectarians in the divine pecking order, and sectarian love of insiders and hatred of outsiders served as emotional endorsements of this value system." Ibid., 241.

364. On Qumranic dualism, see: Helmer Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, trans. Emilie T. Sander (New York: Crossroad, 1995), 68–80; Géza G. Xeravits, ed., *Dualism in Qumran*, LSTS 76 (London: T&T Clark, 2010).

365. Schiffman summarises: "The sect believed that its interpretations were arrived at under some form of divine inspiration by which God's will would be discovered. According to the Qumran sect, the Law fell into two categories, the *nigleh* ('revealed') and the *nistar* ('hidden'). The *niglot* are those laws rooted in Scripture whose interpretations are obvious to anyone. The *nistarot*, on the other hand, are those commandments the correct interpretation of which is known only to the sect. The sectarian interpretation of the *nisarot* is the result of a

expose them to the divine knowledge, which only the members are permitted to know.³⁶⁶ Stendahl insightfully observes:

[T]he attitude of non-retaliation is by no means a type of love. To pursue outsiders with good is a special case of 'the eternal hatred', not of love.... With the Day of Vengeance at hand the proper and reasonable attitude is to forego one's own vengeance and to leave vengeance to God. Why walk around with a little shotgun when the atomic blast is imminent? Whatever we may think about such a frame of mind, there can be little doubt that it is in such a framework that the juxtaposition of non-retaliation and hatred in the Qumran texts can be understood.... We note that the attitude of non-retaliation is motivated by the admonition to give room for God's judgment, the Wrath (v.19).³⁶⁷

The real aim behind this principle of non-retaliation is not pacifistic peace but the wrath of God. Mermelstein also observes:

In this scheme, disengagement is a demonstration of power, not of weakness, as it facilitates vindication and redemption. Love and hate are not simply emotions, beliefs that insiders are indispensable and outsiders detrimental to their wellbeing, but rather are vehicles through which the sectarian can demonstrate that he has been divinely elected.

process of inspired biblical exegesis, a sort of divinely guided *midrash*. Study sessions were regarded as a medium through which God made known to the sect the correct interpretations of His commandments." Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 15. For a fuller exposition, see: idem, *The Halakhah at Qumran*, SJLA 16 (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 22–32.

Baumgarten also notes, with reference to 1QS 9:16-20: "The belief that the knowledge of the Law is not accessible at all times and not to all men is one of the salient aspects of Qumran doctrine. It applies not only to pre-Sinaitic times as in Jubilees 33:16, where Reuben's intercourse with his father's concubine is explained, 'for until that time there had not been revealed the ordinance and judgment and law in its completeness for all'." Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran*, 30–31.

366. The Hymn of the Maskil (1QS 10:17-21) also contains corresponding themes that are drawn from Lev 19:17-18.

367. Krister Stendahl, "Hate, Non-retaliation, and Love: 1QS X,17-20 and Rom. 12:19-21," *HTR* 55 (1962): 344-46.

...by not reproving outsiders, the sect retains its monopoly over that knowledge, dooming non-sectarians to destruction.³⁶⁸

The Yahadic attitude towards the outsider then is recapitulated in 1QS 9:21c-22a: *'Eternal hatred against the men of the pit in the spirit of concealment'* (שנאת עולם עם אנשי שחת ברוח הסתר).

4.3.2 Rebuke as a legal requirement

An extensive treatment of rebuke emerges in 5:24c-6:1, which forms a subunit within 1QS 5:1-6:23. The disjunction at 5:24c, which introduces the command to rebuke, signals the beginning of a new subunit. As in CD 9:2-8a, which takes up and amplifies the theme of Lev 19:17-18a, a type of summary on reproof is found in 1QS 5:24c-6:1.³⁶⁹

1QS 5:24-6:1³⁷⁰

... להוכיח	5:24
איש את רעהו בא[מ]ת וענוה ואהבת חסד לאיש	5:25
אל ידבר ³⁷¹ אלוהיה באפ או בתלונה	
או בעורפ [קשה או בקנאת] רוח רשע ואל ישנאו [בעור]ל[ת] לבבו כיא ביום() יוכיחו ולוא	5:26
ישא עליו עוון וגמ אל יביא איש על רעהו דבר לפני הרבים אשר לוא בתוכחת לפני עדים	6:1

368. Mermelstein, "Love and Hate," 252, 254.

369. Hempel, *The Laws*, 32–33; Carol Newsom, *The Self As Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*, STDJ 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 140–42. Schiffman notes three important points regarding this passage: [i] there is an obvious linguistic parallel between 1QS 5:24–26 and CD 9:2–8, which confirms the affinity of S with CD, [ii] the Qumran law requires the proof under discussion "before charges are brought *in court*," and [iii] 1QS 5 clarifies the requirement for witnesses (other than those who saw the offense) to be present when the reproof is made, thus rendering reproof as "a forensic procedure which must be executed in accord with specific legal norms)." Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 94–95.

370. Cf. 4QS MS-D, Frg.1, Col.2.

371. The reading of 1QS is difficult, and the translation follows רעהו of 4QS MS-D, Frg.1, Col.2:5.

They shall admonish one another in t[ru]th, humility, and merciful love to another. He must not speak to his fellow with anger or with a snarl, or with a [stiff] neck [or in a jealous] spirit of wickedness. And he must not hate him [in the fores]k[in] of his heart, for he shall admonish him on (the very same) day lest he bear iniquity because of him. And also let no man accuse his companion before the Many without a confrontation before witnesses....

As in CD 6:20b, 1QS 5:24c seems to function as a heading. The structure of S's command to rebuke closely resembles CD 6:20b:

להוכיח איש את רעהו ... לאיש	1QS 5:24-25
לאהוב איש את אחיהו כמהו	CD 6:20b

S interweaves the prohibition against “harbouring a grudge” (5:26), “avenging” (6:1) and “hating” (5:26) against the fellow member into its legal system, which are commands clearly drawn from Lev 19:17-18. The structure of 1QS 5:24c-6:1b may be delineated as follows:

להוכיח איש את רעהו	(Lev 19:17b)	Heading
בא[מ]ת וענוה ואהבת חסד לאיש		Manner
אל ידבר אלוהיה		Prohibition I
באפ או בתלונה או בעורפ [קשה או בקנאת] רוח רשע		Manner
ואל ישנאהו [בעור]ל[ת] לבבו	(Lev 19:17a)	Prohibition II
כיא ביומ() יוכיחנו	(Lev 19:17b)	Remedy
ולוא ישא עליו עון	(Lev 19:17c)	Rationale
אל יביא איש על רעהו דבר לפני הרבים		Prohibition III
אשר לוא בתוכחת לפני עדים		Condition

After positing that one ought to rebuke his neighbour in 5:25, S immediately qualifies the disposition with or manner in which one ought to act: באמת וענוה ואהבת חסד. Three prohibitions are tagged onto the heading. Prohibition I (5:25b-26a) reinforces the statement of 5:24c-25a by prohibiting its opposite. It

even spells out the inner disposition with which one should not practice יכח. Prohibition II (5:26b) corresponds to Lev 19:17a and employs the formulation “not this, but rather that” again. One ought not to hate but rather one ought to rebuke. אל ישנאהו is contrasted with two clauses, namely, the heading (להוכיח) and the phrase that follows (יזכחנו). As in Lev 19, S’s formulation here implies that the one who fails to rebuke his brother in effect hates him. This contrast stresses the indispensability of reproof among the members.

The members are not only commanded to rebuke, but the phrase [...] ביום (‘on the [very same] day’) specifies the condition for such a reproof.³⁷² The members must reprove each other on the same day in which they notice someone’s error. The immediacy of rebuke is meant to serve as a cure that dispels רשע [קשה או בקנאת] רוח רשע, באפ או בתלונה או בעורפ [קשה או בקנאת], thereby preventing them from deteriorating into hidden hatred. Schiffman states that this condition is meant to highlight “the spirit of love in which reproof must be given. Otherwise, if one fails to reprove his fellow, he may come to hate him... If he fails to perform the reproof on the very day of the offense, he bears the transgression.”³⁷³

The next phrase, ולא ישא עליו עון (‘so that he will not bear guilt on account of him’), provides the rationale. S disambiguates the equivocal phrase of Lev 19:17c (ולא תשא עליו חטא) by exchanging חטא with עון. As in CD 9, the failure to rebuke the fellow member on the same day was considered to be a wilful neglect on the part of the litigator, which in return imputes the sin of the accused to the litigator. In Kugel's words:

372. Schiffman observes that ויום derives from direct reference to the exegesis of Lev 19:17 in the light of Num 30:15, which expresses the idea of “on the same day” with יום אל מיום. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 94. Milgrom also cites Ezek 4:10-11 and notes that this is a Hebrew idiom to mean “on the same day.” Milgrom, *Numbers*, 254.

373. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 93.

...even if the offender's crime be a capital offense, it is accounted to the one who failed to reproach him at once. Thus, "you shall surely reproach your neighbor and you shall bear no sin because of him" now means, in effect, that one who fails to reproach his neighbor but "stores up" the offense will indeed "bear sin because of him"—the very sin of which his neighbor was guilty!³⁷⁴

A couple of additional details show that this passage in S is a reworking of Lev 19:17-18. First, 1QS 7:8-9 stipulates punishment up to a year for those who unjustly bear a grudge against the fellow or take revenge for themselves. Bearing a grudge and taking revenge clearly refer to the prohibitions of Lev 19:18a, which are immediately contrasted with the love command. Second, S's demand for the members to hate the Sons of the Pit and not to enlighten them out of their pending doom through reproof may be read as "do not love them by rebuking them."³⁷⁵ This clearly shows S's ideational thread: to love is to rebuke according to the Rule of the community, and to hate is to do precisely the opposite. This point is reinforced in 1QS 9:15-23, which concretely delimits the object of the admonition (להוכיח) regarding דעת אמת ומשפט צדק ('true knowledge and righteous judgment') to בִּיחָרֵי דֶרֶךְ ('the chosen of the Way'; 9:17-18). Thus the command to admonish in S is never general and unqualified. One ought to admonish only the members, each according to רִחוּוֹ בְּתִכּוֹן הָעֵת ('to his spirit and according to the norm of the Endtime'; 1QS 9:18). They are also to separate themselves from those who fail to abandon the way of deceit (1QS 9:20-21).

374. Kugel, "On Hidden Hatred," 54-55. He also observes some similarities and differences between Qumran and Matt 18:15 on this topic.

375. "Reproof, in other words, was a 'socially dictated performance' of emotion that demonstrated the sectarian's commitment to sectarian norms." Mermelstein, "Love and Hate," 250.

4.3.3 No גר in S?

Before concluding this section, the absence of the גר in S may be briefly considered. His absence has led some to postulate that the גר was not part of the community(ies) reflected in S. While the גר is not mentioned in S, it does not necessarily mean that foreigners who sought to join the movement (like the גר of CD) were altogether absent in S. In fact, the absence of the גר in S can be interpreted in at least two ways. The easier explanation is to construe the absence of the term גר as evidence for his exclusion from the S community(ies), as Gillihan maintains.³⁷⁶ On the contrary, one could argue that the absence of the term גר results not from his exclusion but his full inclusion. For example, the tripartite division of the community ([i] הכוהנים, [ii] הזקנים, and [iii] שאר כול העם) in 1QS 6:8-9 has caused some to posit the exclusion of the גר, especially in view of CD 14:3-6 where the גר is explicitly included. However, 1QS 6:8-9 does not necessarily imply this. In fact, the list is quite different from the one in CD 14:3-6. Whereas CD 14:3-6 employs a genealogical classification, 1QS 6:8-9 categorises its members based on their communal function.³⁷⁷ As such, S does not list the גר here but neither does S list הלויים nor בני ישראל. If one were to assume that שאר כול העם includes הלויים and בני ישראל, then there is no reason why the גר could not also be included in this category, unless one *a priori* rejects the possibility of his inclusion. It

376. Gillihan, "The גר Who Wasn't There," 295–98.

377. Schiffman explains the difference between CD 14 and here as "the differing settings which the texts portray. The *Manual of Discipline* legislates for the sectarian center at Qumran, whereas the *Zadokite Fragments* are directed at those in the sectarian settlements within the cities of the Land of Israel. It may be, therefore, that proselytes did not enter the sectarian center, but were only part of the outlying branches of the sect." Schiffman, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*, STDJ 75 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 385.

would seem perfectly natural to assume that the גר was included in the “everyone else” category, if one assumes that S maintained an even more inclusive attitude towards the גר than CD did.³⁷⁸ For example, in the light of differing attitudes towards the Temple evinced in CD (ambiguous) and S (total separation), Kapfer suggests that CD reflects an earlier stage of the community’s development and S reflects a later one.³⁷⁹ Kapfer discerns an evolutionary trajectory in these Qumranic texts, wherein the changing attitudes vis-à-vis the Temple evolved from CD’s undecided and vacillating stance to S’s decided and staunchly separatist one. The same line of reasoning could also be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the גר. In spite of the fact that CD classifies the גר as a legitimate insider, CD still maintains the term גר. It is conceivable that S eliminates the term גר in an attempt to promote his full inclusion. In other words, it could be argued that S actually reflects a more developed and integrative view in connexion with the גר than CD does. This thesis makes no attempt to solve this question, but suffice it to say, the absence of the term “גר” in S does not automatically imply his exclusion.

4.3.4 Interim summary

S explicitly quotes every element of the Lev 19:17-18 except for the actual phrase “love your neighbour.” Given that [i] rebuke is an integral constituent of the levitical love command, [ii] S specifies the procedure on

378. Jokiranta, ‘Conceptualizing *Ger*’, 676-77.

379. Kapfer, “The Relationship”; also Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 201; John J. Collins, “Sectarian Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *OHDSS*; Charlotte Hempel, *Damascus Texts*, Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 54. However, Regev disagrees with Kapfer and proposes the opposite development trajectory based on his comparative survey of sect development: Regev, “Between Two Sects,” 447-48; idem, “Comparing Sectarian Practice and Organization: The Qumran Sects in Light of the Regulations of the Shakers, Hutterites, Mennonites and Amish,” *Numen* 51 (2004): 146-81.

reproof, much like how CD does, and [iii] S exhibits a great concern for interpersonal love and hate right from the outset (1QS 1:3-4), it may be reasonably inferred that S interweaves its interpretation of Lev 19:17-18 into the composition. If this is correct, then two points of observation may be highlighted concerning the reception of the love command in S.

First, the idea of love is inseparably married to hatred in S. Whereas Leviticus commands love and *prohibits* hatred with regards to one's neighbour, S *commands* both love for the sons of light and hate for the sons of darkness. Both Leviticus and S maintain that love and hate are antithetical insofar as they are directed to the same object, that is, one cannot love and hate the same person simultaneously. Even though S does not explicitly prohibit hatred towards the fellow member, this is tacitly but certainly assumed. However, where different objects of love and hate are concerned, Leviticus and S exhibit an important difference. Leviticus forbids a specific kind of hatred, qualifying it with two circumstantial factors, namely, the manner of hating and its object. As shown in Chapter Two, Leviticus proscribes "hidden hatred" against one's neighbour, which includes the גר, as a way of reinforcing the positive command to love. The prohibition of hatred in Leviticus functions as a foil for the love command. Leviticus remains equivocal about how one ought to relate to those who fall outside of the parameter of the "neighbour." In short, hatred is never prescribed in Leviticus. By contrast, S strengthens the function of hate. In S love and hate are complementary: to love rightly is to hate correctly. To love truly those whom God has chosen necessarily means to hate those whom God has rejected. Thus, while Leviticus does not command hatred towards the "non-neighbour," S specifies not only the object of love but also the object of

hatred. S subsumes everyone to be either the members' object of love or object of hate. One could argue from silence that Leviticus supports the hate towards the non-neighbour, since the levitical prohibition of hidden hatred towards one's brother only applies to Israelites and the *גֵּר*. But the conceptual link between loving one's neighbour and hating the non-neighbour is never established in Leviticus. Unlike S, Leviticus never creates a clear equation that the love for the insider *necessarily implies* hatred towards the outsiders. Fundamental to S's conception of love then is hatred; they are two sides of the same coin and ought to be rigorously pursued. This remarkably clear-cut and bold marriage of love and hate based on its dualistic outlook runs right through the vein of S.

Second, S exhibits an increased fixation on reproof as fulfilment of the command to love the fellow member. S glues the act of love even tighter with the legal practice of reproof than Leviticus does. Conversely, the act of hate is equated with forsaking those who err to wallow in their sin. S seems to elaborate on the legal procedure of reproof as a faithful response to the demands of the love command. While procedural details regarding "open reproof" in Lev 19:17-18 remains unspecified, S fleshes out, as does CD, the detail for putting reproof into practice. In S then, reproof is a—if not the—crucial component of obeying the love command. Schiffman rightly notes, "Reproof at Qumran was not simply a moral duty. Rather, it was a prerequisite for conviction of all offenses, and it had to be performed according to specific regulations."³⁸⁰ To love then is to rebuke openly and in full accordance with the rule as revealed to those in the Yahadic community.

380. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 89.

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter has examined the interpretation of Lev 19:18 in the DSS. The reception of Lev 19:18 is not monolithic, and both CD and S reveal related but different takes on it. First, while both CD and S show great concern for interpreting and applying Lev 19:18, the loci of application are quite different. CD interprets the love command within a halakhic framework and accentuates the demand for actively pursuing the well-being of the weak and the needy (CD 6:20-7:4; 14:12-17). By contrast, S interprets Lev 19:18 within a much larger conceptual framework and cements the binary opposition of love for the insider and hate for the outsider.³⁸¹ Unlike Leviticus, Jubilees or even CD, S affirms that righteous love necessarily implies righteous hatred and that both aspects ought to be pursued zealously. This highly evocative language of S is meant not only to describe but also to construct and reinforce the communal identity and boundary.

Second, for all the differences between CD's and S's interpretations, they both stress the importance of reproof in a remarkably similar way. Lev 19:17-18 demands open reproof as the remedy for hidden hatred and as the exercise of the love of neighbour. Both CD and S take this demand seriously and "legalise" the procedure of open reproof in order to make the levitical love command practicable. Both CD (9:2-8) and S (1QS 5:24-6:1) exhibit great concern not only for the act of reproof itself (Lev 19:17b) but the attitude with and the manner in which one reproves the fellow Covenanter (Lev 19:18a). The fact that both CD and S spell out what constitute "bearing a grudge" and

381. This is not to say that S-tradition as a whole evidences more or less openness than does D-tradition, or vice versa. This thesis makes no attempt to address the wider topic of how CD and S relate to each other. Rather, *specifically with regards to the use of Lev 19:18*, the scope of its application is more far-reaching in S than in CD.

“taking vengeance” in stipulating open reproof reveals their deep concern for responding to this levitical mandate.

Third, the fact that CD uses Lev 19:18 as a heading in its composition and S consistently interweaves the motif of intra-communal love into its composition shows the growing importance of the levitical love command. The command to love the neighbour, that is, the fellow Covenanter, is no longer just one precept among many, but a principle that governs intra-communal relations (CD) or a fundamental belief that shapes and regulates the Yahadic frame of mind (S).

Lastly, CD shows a great concern for the inclusion of the גר. CD takes the openness of Lev 19:33-34 towards the גר to its logical extension by recasting the גר as a legitimate, full member of the movement, albeit he is still on the lower end of the hierarchy. Whether S includes or excludes the גר from its community(ies) remains unresolved, although I am inclined to see his inclusion.

Chapter Five

Lev 19:18 in the New Testament

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will consider the six citations of Lev 19:18 in the Greek NT. In addition to the triply attested, Double Love Command tradition in the Gospels, Lev 19:18 is cited in Gal 5:15, Rom 13:8-10, and Jas 2:8. Naturally, a study of reception history should examine the texts in their chronological order, starting from the oldest to the youngest. The problem is, of course, that for some of the NT texts, the date of composition does not necessarily correspond to the earliness or lateness of the tradition preserved in them. For instance, while Galatians may have been the first to be written down, the Double Love Command tradition preserved in the Gospels (i.e., the texts that were clearly composed later than Galatians) seems in fact to predate Galatians.³⁸² Whether or not and precisely how much of the traditions that

382. On the question of whether or not the Double Love Command goes back to Jesus, Davies and Allison cautiously answer in the affirmative: "(i) the tendency of early Christian catechesis was to quote the commandment to love the neighbour without referring to loving God; (ii) unlike the passages in Aristeas and Philo, neither the pre-Markan nor non-Markan tradition we postulate reflects Stoic terminology; (iii) the double commandment coheres with Jesus' words and deeds...." W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr, *Commentary on Matthew XIX-XXVIII*, vol. 3 of *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 238. Tomson also contends, "First and foremost we must consider the gospel tradition, which Paul as a trained Pharisee undoubtedly knew in oral form; incidental paraphrastic reference to *logia* of Jesus seem to confirm this." Peter J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles*, CRINT Section III: Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature 1 (Assen/

each writer knew correspond to the earlier traditions recorded in the Gospels are difficult to ascertain, but some literary-traditional influence is without a doubt observable. Yet, each writer makes a unique use of Lev 19:18, and it is these differences that provide us the opportunity to examine the diverging reception of Lev 19:18 in the NT.

This chapter is in no way exhaustive. While the comprehensive analysis of the theology of the love of neighbour and its reception in each of the NT books would be ideal, such an undertaking would be far beyond the scope of this thesis. It would involve examining each of the Gospels and the Epistles in its entirety to see how the overall shape of the book and each of the authors' theology of neighbourly love contribute to their reception of Lev 19:18. Fortunately, a number of monograph-length works have already undertaken this task (see Ch.1), and this chapter will draw extensively from their studies.

In his influential work on the love command in the NT, Furnish stresses the importance of the "full context" in understanding each writer's philosophy of neighbourly love. Furnish himself focusses on "the love *ethic*, the love *command*, what the New Testament teaches and otherwise reflects about earliest Christianity's view of loving one's brother, neighbor, and one's enemy" (italics Furnish's).³⁸³ It is hardly disputable that the idea of neighbourly love or loving each other finds a much fuller expression in various sections of the NT, especially when set side by side with earlier Jewish writings from the Second Temple period. For example, even on a cursory reading, the Gospel of John or Ephesians evidences a highly

Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1990), 265-66.

383. Furnish, *The Love Command*, 19.

developed understanding of neighbourly love. One could consider the repeated command to “love one another” in the Fourth Gospel (13:34-35; cf. 15:12-17) and First John (4:7-21; cf. 2:10; 3:10-14, 18-23) as the Evangelist’s thoughtful application of the Double Love Command tradition.³⁸⁴ Or, one could study the call for mutual love between spouses in Eph 5:25-33 as a theological extension of the love of neighbour. While these are certainly intriguing instances of neighbourly love broadly defined, a thorough treatment of these passages alone would require another thesis. As such, while many other texts in the NT could be considered as an extended reception of Lev 19:18, the focus of this chapter will be quite specific, even more so than that of Spicq’s.³⁸⁵ This chapter will only consider the citations of Lev 19:18 alone. Again, even though a full-fledged investigation of the concept of love in the NT and its rich, theological implications would be ideal, the aim is much more modest. This chapter seeks neither to study comprehensively the love of God nor even the theology of the love of neighbour but how the NT writers received and cited Lev 19:18. In order to navigate successfully through the vast ocean of literature, our enquiry will be guided by the following questions: how is the levitical love command received and cited in six passages? What sort of continuity and discontinuity can one identify with regards to the interpretation of Lev 19:18 in the NT?

384. Ibid., 196-97.

385. Furnish points out that Spicq’s work “focuses his attention so exclusively on passages where the *word* ‘love’ occurs, that he constantly ignores many other texts which reflect just as much, or even more, about a given writer’s view of the meaning and requirements of love in the Christian life. In this regard it must be stressed that the ‘full context’ of the love command in any given source must include the way it is theologically grounded and construed, the way it is illustrated and applied, and its place in relation to other ethical commands and norms.” Furnish, *The Love Command*, 20.

This chapter will follow the generally agreed chronology of the NT texts, starting with Galatians and ending with the Synoptic Gospels. While the date of composition for each book continues to be contested and while it is important to establish the *relative* dating of these texts (especially if some of the writers knew or used the other texts; e.g., James' knowledge of Paul's letters; Matthean or Lukan redaction of Mark and Q), the issue of dating does not significantly affect our conclusion.

Finally, let it be noted at the outset of this chapter that I have found no reason to contest the common assertion that ὡς σεαυτόν in the NT should be rendered adverbially. Unlike in the LXX, the meaning of ὡς σεαυτόν (כמוך), or the construction of ὡς immediately followed by a pronoun, consistently yields the adverbial sense ('as yourself') in the NT.³⁸⁶ By way of illustration, the ὡς + pronoun construction (viz., ὡς immediately followed by a pronoun) occurs twenty-three times in the NT. Excluding the citations taken from the LXX (which purportedly have a strong "semitic influence" according to BDAG), that is, ten instances that have been identified as full or partial quotations taken from Lev 19 (Matt 19:19, 22:39; Mark 12:31, 33; Luke 10:27; Rom 13:9; Gal 5:14; Jam 2:8) and Deut 18 (Act 3:22; 7:37), the following thirteen instances remain.

ὡς + pronoun in NT

Matt 26:39	πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλ' ὡς σύ. (x2)	(adv.)
Mark 9:21	πόσος χρόνος ἐστὶν ὡς τοῦτο γέγονεν αὐτῷ;	(adv.)
Luke 18:11	ἢ καὶ ὡς οὗτος ὁ τελώνης.	(adj.)
Acts 2:15	οὐ γὰρ ὡς ὑμεῖς ὑπολαμβάνετε οὗτοι μεθύουσιν	(adv.)
2 Cor 3:1	ἢ μὴ χρήζομεν ὥς τινες συστατικῶν ἐπιστολῶν	(adv.)

386. See BDAG (1103-6) and LSJ (2038-39) for the diverse grammatical function and wide semantic range of ὡς.

Gal 4:12	Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι καὶ γὰρ ὡς ὑμεῖς (x2)	(adv.)
Eph 5:33	ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα οὕτως ἀγαπάτω ὡς ἑαυτόν...	(adv.)
Titus 1:5	ὡς ἐγώ σοι διευταξάμην,	(adv.)
Phlm 17	εἰ οὖν με ἔχεις κοινωνόν, προσλαβοῦ αὐτόν ὡς ἐμέ.	(adv.)
2 Pet 3:9	ὥς τινες βραδύτητα ἡγοῦνται	(adv.)
1 John 1:7	ἐὰν δὲ ἐν τῷ φωτὶ περιπατῶμεν ὡς αὐτός ἐστιν ἐν τῷ φωτί	(adv.)

On the right column above, I have indicated whether the construction calls for the adverbial or the adjectival sense. The ὡς + pronoun construction in the NT almost uniformly calls for the adverbial rendering.³⁸⁷ The linguistic evidence thus seems to support that by the time the NT was written ὡς σεαυτόν was understood as the now-famous adverbial phrase.

387. Cf. Eph 5:33. See also, 1 Cor 7:7 and 2 Cor 3:5 where ὡς is followed closely, though not immediately, by a reflexive pronoun and takes the adverbial force.

5.2 The Pauline love of neighbour

The quotation of Lev 19:18 appears twice in Pauline writings (Gal 5:14; Rom 13:9) with closely related contextual meaning.³⁸⁸ While Paul may have known the Double Love Command tradition, he only cites the latter half. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to delineate Paul's theology of love in general. However, because Paul directly links the idea of fulfilment to the citation of Lev 19:18, the question of Paul's broader understanding of love and its relation to the Law cannot be entirely sidestepped. Paul's wider understanding of love will be examined only insofar as it assists us in

388. On the scholarship on Paul and Law in the twentieth century, see: Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, 1-19. Pauline scholarship (at least in the English-speaking world) has experienced a fundamental reorientation in the wake of Sanders's *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* along with several publications by James Dunn and N. T. Wright. See: E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977); idem, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983); James D. G. Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 65 (1983): 95-122; idem, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006); idem, *The New Perspective on Paul: Collected Essays*, WUNT 185 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); N. T. Wright, *Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (London: T&T Clark, 1993); idem, *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997); idem, *Paul: In Fresh Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005). Since then, the Pauline studies have been moving into various directions beyond the early Sanders-Dunn-Wright paradigm. For a recent and helpful survey on Pauline scholarship, see: Magnus Zetterholm, *Approaches to Paul: A Student's Guide to Recent Scholarship* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2009).

Paul's view of the law and its relation to Christ have been a hotbed of controversies. Some of the representative views include: [i] Paul's thinking on the law was haphazard, and he radically reduces the law to the love command (Räsänen); [ii] Paul's view changed significantly in the course of his writing; ergo different letters evidence different thinkings (Hübner); [iii] Paul maintained a clear distinction between moral and ritual-covenantal aspects of the OT law, and the ethical laws of the OT remained authoritative (Schreiner); [iv] Paul's stark opposition between faith and law only applies to getting into the covenant (which is by faith), not staying in it (Sanders, Dunn). See: Hans Hübner, *Das Gesetz bei Paulus: Ein Beitrag zum Werden der paulinischen Theologie*, FRLANT 119 (Göttingen: V&R, 1978); Heikki Räsänen, *Paul and the Law*, WUNT 29 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983); Brice L. Martin, *Christ and the Law in Paul*, NovTSup 62 (Leiden: Brill, 1989); Thomas R. Schreiner, "The Abolition and Fulfillment of the Law in Paul," *JSNT* 35 (1989): 55-56; Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*.

making sense of his use of Lev 19:18. In this section, I will initially consider Gal 5:13-14 and Rom 13:8-9 separately and then interpret them together.

5.2.1 Gal 5:13-14

The Letter to the Galatians has been long considered to be one of the most authentically Pauline Epistles, written sometime between 40-58 CE.³⁸⁹ Gal 5:13-14 occurs at the very beginning of the section on ethics or moral instruction (5:13-6:10), which immediately precedes the letter's closing (6:11-18).³⁹⁰

13 Ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε, ἀδελφοί· μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις. 14 ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

For you were called to freedom, brothers and sisters; only do not use your freedom as an opportunity for self-indulgence, but through love become slaves to one another. For the whole law is summed up in a single commandment, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself."

Prior to Gal 5, Paul is at pains to establish that those who believe and have faith in Christ have been freed from the Law (cf. 2:16; 3:10-4:31).³⁹¹ Since the primary addressees of the letter is Gentile Jesus-believers in Galatia, Paul's main argument here seems to be that Torah observance should not be added

389. Philip F. Esler, *Galatians*, New Testament Readings (London: Routledge, 1998). The occasion of writing and the issues that Paul is trying to address in Galatians continue to be debated. On the North and South Galatia hypotheses, see: Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, WBC 41 (Waco, TX: Word, 1990), xli-cxix; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 43-56; Esler, *Galatians*, 32-36; G. N. Stanton, "Galatians," in *OBC* (Oxford: OUP, 2007), 1153.

390. Scholars disagree on whether 5:13-6:10 is integral to the preceding chapters or it is disconnected from the earlier chapters, being probably a paranesis or an appendix that was later interpolated. See: John M. G. Barclay, *Obeying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians*, ed. John Riches (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 105, 216.

391. Esler, *Galatians*, 203.

to the faith in Christ as further requirement for the Gentile believers.³⁹²

Tomson succinctly states, “Galatians is about the obligation for gentile Christians to take the Jewish Law and its commandments upon themselves. Paul’s gospel of ‘justification by faith’ liberates them from that obligation.”³⁹³ Gal 5:13 revisits the theme of freedom and slavery (ἐλευθερία; cf. 2:4; 5:1), which connects his argument back to 5:1 (“*For freedom Christ has set us free. Stand firm, therefore, and do not submit again to a yoke of slavery.*”). Considering the stark dichotomy, i.e., faith versus Law, that Paul establishes earlier in the book, it is intriguing as it is revealing that Paul returns to this topic at 5:14. Why reintroduce the very object (i.e., the Law) that he was at pains to demonstrate its obsolescence and ineffectiveness (cf. 4:2)? Against the views of Räisänen (“a radical reduction of the law to the love command”)³⁹⁴ and of Sanders (Paul’s diverse statements about the Law “do not form a logical whole”),³⁹⁵ Westerholm asserts, “Galatians 5:14 cannot be a stray piece of unassimilated theology, involving Paul in unconscious self-contradiction; rather it represents what Paul himself considers a necessary nuance in a presentation of his view.”³⁹⁶ In Paul’s view, although the Gentiles who believe in Christ have been freed from the Law and the Law has no positive role in their salvation, he is still eager for these Jesus-believers to “fulfil” the

392. Martinus C. de Boer, *Galatians*, NTL (Louisville: WJK, 2011), 3-5

393. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, 88. Tomson argues that Paul “pleads for freedom from the Jewish Law for gentiles on the basis of its validity for Jews.” Ibid., 261. Paul seems to have had no objection for Jewish Christians to continue in their Law observance. Paula Fredriksen, “Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul’s Gospel,” *NTS* 56 (2010): 232–52.

394. Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 27. Räisänen argues, “It is only by tacitly reducing the Torah to a moral law that Paul can think of the Christians (as well as of some non-Christian Gentiles, Rom 2.14 f.) as fulfilling the Torah.” Ibid., 28.

395. Sanders, *Paul, the Law*, 4.

396. Stephen Westerholm, “On Fulfilling the Whole Law (Gal 5:14),” *SEÅ* 51 (1986): 232.

Law. Paul wants to demonstrate somehow that “the believer ‘fulfills’ the whole law without being bound by its precepts,” and that this particular freedom and faith are in no way morally bankrupt.³⁹⁷ Accordingly, in Gal 5:14, which echoes 5:6 (*‘faith working through love’*), Paul carefully qualifies that the freedom he speaks of has “stringent moral obligations built into it—not the obligations of the law but the obligation of love.”³⁹⁸ To this end, Paul commands three things in 5:13-14, although only 13c is in the imperative form (δουλεύετε).

Imperative	13b Do not use your freedom wrongly
Imperative	13c Become slaves to one another
Indicative	14a The whole Law is fulfilled in a word
Indicative/Imperative	14b “You shall love your neighbour as yourself”

The first clause (13b: *μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί*) is a verbless clause, but the verb (viz., “use” or “turn”) can be readily supplied in context with an imperative force.³⁹⁹ Betz observes that *ἀφορμή* is “originally a military term (‘starting point, base of operations’), but it is used here more generally (‘opportunity, pretext’).”⁴⁰⁰ Martyn thinks Paul retains this military usage and actually “employs the imagery of a struggle that that can become a military battle.”⁴⁰¹ Boer also argues that *ἀφορμή* takes on the sense that “at the present juncture in the drama of salvation inaugurated by Christ, freedom from the Law can be used as a staging area for the Flesh’s pernicious assaults

397. Ibid., 233.

398. Barclay, *Obedying*, 109.

399. Boer, *Galatians*, 335.

400. Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Churches in Galatia*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 272. Also: BDAG.

401. James Louis Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB 33A (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 485.

on believers.”⁴⁰² That the freedom given by the spirit is not to be usurped by the “flesh” (σάρξ) is clear, but there continues to be disagreement regarding the precise definition of this term.⁴⁰³ Betz, for one, contends:

In Galatians flesh as an anthropological concept describes (1) man as a being of ‘flesh and blood’, his physical body, morality, and frailty; and (2) the Christian as a battlefield of the opposing forces of flesh and Spirit. Having been given the Spirit (3:2, 5) and having been granted freedom from sin (1:4; 2:15-17; 3:22), Law (2:16, 19; 3:13,24-25; 4:4-5; 5:18), and the ‘elements of the world’ (4:3, 9), the Christian in this life still exists ἐν σαρκί (‘in the flesh’: 2:20; 4:14; 6:7-10). This ‘flesh’ has a life of its own; it produces ‘desires and passions’ (5:16-17, 19-21) which are at work against the Spirit. Although the Christian has ‘crucified’ his ‘flesh’, together with its passions and its desires’ (5:24), this flesh has not been altogether eliminated but continues to be a potential threat.⁴⁰⁴

Barclay also points out that the meaning of σάρξ is multifarious and Paul himself uses it in diverse ways. However, the employment of the πνεῦμα-σάρξ dualism “in relation to the apocalyptic themes” of Galatians suggests that Paul “is using σάρξ to designate *what is merely human*, in contrast to the divine

402. Boer, *Galatians*, 335.

403. Barclay observes that while the Spirit-flesh dualism is used as “anthropological terms” (1 Cor 5:5; 2 Cor 7:1; Col 2:5; Rom 1:3-4; 2:28-29; Phil 3:3-4; 1 Tim 3:16), it is “remarkably rare in an *ethical* context” (italics Barclay’s). Barclay, *Obedying*, 178.

404. Betz, *Galatians*, 272. Martyn follows Betz. Martyn, *Galatians*, 487-88. Dunn also writes, “By ‘flesh’, as usual, Paul means the human condition in its belongingness to this world -- that is, the weakness of the human being in contrast to the power of the divine, the dependency of the creature on the satisfaction of bodily appetites, and the tendency of the physical body to decay and corruption.” James D. G. Dunn, *Epistle to the Galatians*, BNTC (London: Blackwell, 1993), 287. Similarly, Fung notes, “‘Flesh’ denotes not merely the bodily passions and lusts, nor even strictly speaking a ‘lower nature’ contrasted with a ‘higher nature’ in a person, but rather the human individual in his or her sin and depravity apart from the redeeming grace of God and the sanctifying work of the Spirit.” Ronald Y. K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 244. On the history of scholarship on the Spirit-Flesh dualism, see: Robert Jewett, *Paul’s Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*, AGJU 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 49-166; Barclay, *Obedying*, 182-215.

activity displayed on the cross and in the gift of the Spirit.” (italics Barclay’s).⁴⁰⁵ For Paul, *σάρξ* is “an ‘umbrella-term’ under which he can gather such disparate entities as libertine behaviour, circumcision, a range of social vices and life under the law.”⁴⁰⁶ Specifically in Gal 5:13, “the Flesh is depicted as a dangerous malevolent suprahuman, and cosmic power.”⁴⁰⁷ Paul seems to devise the dualism of spirit versus flesh rather than sin versus righteousness in an attempt to move away from the existing category of sin (*ἁμαρτία*), which was inevitably associated with disobedience to the Law.⁴⁰⁸ Spicq opines, “Good moralist that he is, St. Paul warns the faithful against the danger of yielding to the desires of their lower nature (v. 16; cf. v. 13) whose demands are radically opposed to those of the *pneuma* (v. 17).”⁴⁰⁹

Paul’s second imperative (14c: διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις) is a shocking statement in view of the Hellenistic conception of freedom, which was radically at odds with being bound to anything, let alone slavery.⁴¹⁰ Whereas slavery implies a hierarchical social order, Paul’s call for slavery to love assumes mutuality of self-sacrifice, that is, to one another (*ἀλλήλοις*). Paul consciously introduces a paradox here: the Galatians are to use their freedom in the slavery of love. Barclay observes that Paul “represents this *δουλεία* not as the antithesis of freedom but as its necessary outworking.”⁴¹¹

405. Ibid., 206.

406. Ibid., 209.

407. Boer, *Galatians*, 329. Boer points out that Paul’s conception of cosmic, supra-human power finds its root in Jewish tradition. Ibid., 337-39. Martyn argues that *σάρξ* in this section is a shorthand for the expression *ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς* (‘the desires of the flesh’; Gal 5:16). Martyn, *Galatians*, 485.

408. Barclay, *Obedying*, 109-10.

409. Spicq, *Agape*, II:40.

410. On the Hellenistic conception of freedom, see: Furnish, *The Love Command*, 98.

411. Barclay, *Obedying*, 109.

Then comes a profound declaration: for the whole Law is “fulfilled” (πληρώω) in one word (λόγος).⁴¹² While the word νόμος occurs as many as thirty-two times in Galatians,⁴¹³ Paul never defines this term. Despite this lack of a definition, the term is best understood as a reference to the Mosaic Law throughout Galatians, and most certainly in 5:13-14.⁴¹⁴ The fact that the quotation of a single command (Lev 19:18), which is said to sum up the whole Law, is itself part of the Mosaic Law strengthens this case.⁴¹⁵

412. Boer observes, “As the conjunction ‘for’ (*gar*) indicates, the exhortation of v. 13c probably constitutes Paul’s interpretation and application of Lev 19:18 to the Galatian situation before he has cited it in support. That is why v. 14 appears to interrupt the flow of Paul’s argument about the dangers of the Flesh (v. 13b-c). . . .” Boer, *Galatians*, 341.

413. Gal 2:16 [x3], 19 [x2], 21; 3:2, 5, 10 [x2], 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 21 [x3], 23, 24; 4:4, 5, 21 [x2]; 5:3, 4, 14, 18, 23; 6:2, 13.

414. Closely related phrases (or a set of phrases) are found: ἔργα νόμου (‘works of the law’; cf. 2:16 [x3]; 3:2, 5, 10) as well as its parallel expression ἔργα τῆς σαρκός (‘works of the flesh’; 5:19). Dunn draws a semantic distinction between these phrases, contending that Paul “wrote as a Jew anxious to fulfil the covenant obligations of his people” for whom the law was still an “important yardstick for Christian conduct.” Dunn wants to maintain that while Paul opposed the “works of the law” (e.g., circumcision), he still believed in observing the law. Dunn, *Galatians*, 291. For Dunn’s response to criticism of several scholars (especially Cranfield), see: Dunn, *The New Perspective*, 207-20. Although Dunn’s proposal is ingenious, Esler successfully undermines his position. In addition to an objection from social identity theory, Esler offers the following exegetical counterarguments. First, with regards to righteousness that comes from faith, Paul seems to make no distinction between ἔργα νόμου and νόμος in Galatians (2:16, 21; 3:10-11; 5:4-5). Second, “Paul is thinking about the law in its entirety” (3:10; 5:3), and his assertion that he has died to the law and not just to the “works of the law” (2:18-19) problematises Dunn’s reading. Third, Paul’s charge against his opponents in 6:13 shows that the commitment to the more public practices/works (i.e., circumcision) was not the issue at stake since “the fulfilment of the ethical requirements of the law would have been just as important to the internal sense of boundary as some of the more public observances like food restrictions and circumcision.” It is significant that Paul uses the phrase “the law” rather than “the works of the law” at this point. Paul is clearly able to and in fact does make careful distinctions between key terms in his writings, e.g., his deliberate use of σάρξ over against ἁμαρτία. As such, Paul probably employs the phrases the law and the works of the law interchangeably in Galatians because they are in fact interchangeable in his argument. Finally, Gal 5:14 highlights that “if you have love (which, of course, you get as a gift of the Spirit in the community of believers, 5:22), you do not need the law. Love, derived from the Spirit and not from the law, is being proposed as a substitute for the law.” For Paul then, the choice is certainly not “Christ versus works or some aspects of the law” but “Christ versus the law in its entirety.” Esler, *Galatians*, 181-84.

415. Hübner proposes that ὁ πᾶς νόμος refers to “totality” of some other (viz., non-Mosaic)

Moreover, most scholars observe that Paul employs $\pi\alpha\tilde{\varsigma}$ here to mean, “a whole rather than an aggregation of individual commandments,” so “the whole law” here most likely refers to the Mosaic Law in its entirety.⁴¹⁶ Individual stipulations of the Torah, which are often summarised by the Decalogue, are further distilled into this one key phrase. In other words, Paul condenses “more specifically the ten commandments, into the single commandment of love—‘One word,’ not ‘Ten words’; a *monologos* rather than a *dekalogos*.”⁴¹⁷ In equating a single command (Lev 19:18) with the Law in its entirety at 5:14, Paul chooses the word $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\acute{o}\omega$ rather than $\pi\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (cf. 3:10, 12; 5:3).⁴¹⁸ The precise sense of $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\acute{o}\omega$ is widely debated, though most interpreters take the perfect tense of this verb in a gnomic sense (‘is fulfilled’).⁴¹⁹ This is most likely an ellipsis of “fulfilled in the practice of this

law, but Barclay judiciously objects to this reading. See: Hübner, *Das Gesetz*, 37-43; Barclay, *Obeying*, 137. Sanders also points out the problem with Hübner’s view, see: Sanders, *Paul, the Law*, 96-100. Martyn disagrees with the majority view, and he argues that the law in Gal 5:14 refers to “the voice of the original, pre-Sinaitic Law that articulates God’s own mind (3:8; 4:21b).” Martyn, *Galatians*, 488-89, 502-23. Boer advances a similar line of reasoning, except he thinks the law here refers to “the Scripture.” Boer, *Galatians*, 342.

416. Dunn, *Galatians*, 288. Also, Fung, *Galatians*, 245. Or in Betz’s words, “a principle rather than the sum-total of individual prescriptions and prohibitions.” Betz, *Galatians*, 275. Again, Martyn thinks Paul deliberately uses the phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omega$ rather than $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\lambda\eta$ as a reference to “the original, singular Law that did not consist of commandments.” Martyn, *Galatians*, 491. He continues with a rhetorical question: “Could it be, then, that in 5:14 Paul thinks of a Law that was singular at its inception, its singularity being now revealed and/or climactically restored at the juncture at which it has been brought to completion?” Ibid., 505. It is of course possible, though not conclusive, that Paul conceptualised $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ in such abstraction. Yet as noted Paul’s consistent association of $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ with the Mosaic law in the book makes this reading less likely.

417. Fung, *Galatians*, 246-47; cf. Thomas Walter Manson, *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles* (Manchester: University Press, 1962), 189.

418. Betz, *Galatians*, 275.

419. Older commentaries and translations tend to render this verb as “to sum up,” perhaps following the lead of BDAG, which notes that “Gal 5:14 because of its past tense is prob. to be translated *the whole law has found its full expression in a single word or is summed up under one entry*.” BDAG, “ $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\acute{o}\omega$,” 828.

one command," as the parallel usage of this idea in Gal 6:2 and in Rom 13:8-10 shows (see below).⁴²⁰

5:13c-14 [x] διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις
“through love become slave to one another”
 [y] ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται
“for the whole law is summed up in a single commandment”

6:2 [x] Ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε
“Bear one another’s burden”
 [y] καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ
“and in this way you will fulfil the law of Christ”

The notions of “carrying the burden,” which was predominantly the task of slaves, and “fulfilling” of the Law indicate the close connexion between Gal 6:2 and 5:13-14.⁴²¹ The ideas of loving one’s neighbour and bearing one another’s burdens are synonymous in Galatians.⁴²² Paul clearly thinks that to love one’s neighbour, that is, to become slaves to another or to bear one another’s burden, is to “fulfil” (ἀναπληρώω) the Law of Christ.⁴²³ The phrase ὁ

420. Barclay, *Obedying*, 137-38; cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations*, 10th ed. (London: MacMillan, 1902), 208-9; Ernest de Witt Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1964), 295. Martyn, by contrast, argues that *πεπλήρωται* should be understood "having been brought to completion by Christ" and serves as grounds for Paul's exhortation in 5:13-14 and 6:2. Martyn, *Galatians*, 486-91. Boer likewise contends, "The fulfillment of the law is not a goal to be striven for; it is instead presented as the new reality that results whenever believers are in fact loving one another. This situation is one that Paul in v. 22 will call 'the fruit', the outcome of the Spirit's presence. Whenever mutual love happens, those loving (will) 'have fulfilled the law'." Boer, *Galatians*, 346; cf. Martyn, *Galatians*, 548-58.

421. Boer, *Galatians*, 376.

422. Sanders, *Paul, the Law*, 97.

423. Boer notes that the compound form ἀναπληρώω is a more intensive form that means, “completely or thoroughly fulfil.” Boer, *Galatians*, 377.

νόμος τοῦ Χριστοῦ is difficult to interpret, but the genitive τοῦ Χριστοῦ seems to maintain the sense of “in the manner exemplified by Christ.”⁴²⁴

A couple of considerations suggest that Paul deliberately chooses the verb πληρόω—over against other verbs—to express his new understanding of how those who believe in Christ relate to the Law. First, the unique collocation of νόμος and fulfilment is telling. Πληροῦν (whose equivalent is not מלא in the HB) is never used in relation to the Law in the LXX, and other Greek Jewish literature never combines πληροῦν with νόμος (except for a very occasional usage with ἐντολή).⁴²⁵ Even in rabbinic literature where קום gains currency over מלא with reference to meeting the demands of the Law, קום lacks the connotation of “fulness” or “completion.” Second, Paul maintains a distinction between ποιέω (‘doing’) and πληρόω (‘fulfilling’) the Law.⁴²⁶ While ποιέω has a very general sense and may be used in various contexts “including where the Christian practice of righteousness is the topic (cf. Rom. 13:3; 1 Cor. 9:23; 10:31; Gal. 6:9),” it is remarkable that Paul never says those who believe in Christ are obligated to “do” (ποιέω) the Law. Instead, he claims that those who are “under the Law” ought to “do” the Law (Rom 10:5;

424. This reading is likely given the fact that, as Barclay points out, Paul makes explicit connexion between “love” and “Christ” (Gal 2:20; 5:6, 22; cf. Rom 15:1-3). Barclay, *Obedying*, 131-35. Also: Martyn, *Galatians*, 547-48. On various proposals for the meaning of ὁ νόμος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, see: Barclay, *Obedying*, 126-31; Boer, *Galatians*, 378-81. Martyn makes a distinction between “two voices” of the Law, first being “the plural, cursing Law (having its origin at Sinai) and of the singular, promissory, and guiding Law (having its origin in God).” Martyn, *Galatians*, 555, cf. 506-14. Boer maintains a distinction between the way Paul uses νόμος to mean a word (λόγος), as in the case of Lev 19:18, and a commandment (ἐντολή). He argues, “This law of Christ is the scriptural law that attests to the coming of Christ and his Spirit, the Spirit whose fruit is love.” Boer, *Galatians*, 378.

425. Barclay, *Obedying*, 138-39. Barclay points out that Paul seems to have intentionally employed the ambiguity inherent in this word which “leaves unclear the status of the rest of the commandments.” Ibid., 140. See also: C. F. D. Moule, “Fulfilment-Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse,” *NTS* 14 (1968): 293-320.

426. Schreiner disagrees but without any counterarguments. Schreiner, “The Abolition,” 55.

Gal 3:10, 12; 5:3).⁴²⁷ Given Paul's insistence that the Law itself rests "on the principle of 'doing' as opposed to 'believing' (Gal. 3:12; Rom. 10:5-6)," the notion of fulfilling cannot simply be equated with doing.⁴²⁸ Rather, when Paul specifically speaks on Christian behaviour—as those who ought not "submit again to a yoke of slavery" (Gal 5:1)—as it positively relates to the Mosaic Law (Rom 8:4; 13:8; Gal 5:14; 6:2; cf. Rom 13:10 *πλήρωμα νόμου*), his vocabulary of choice is consistently the verb *πληροῦν* or its cognate.⁴²⁹ Paul's bold declaration that Lev 19:18 is the fulfilment of the Law then is indeed "using vocabulary unprecedented in the Jewish tradition," even if other streams of Jewish tradition may have felt at home with the attempt to summarise the entire Torah into a single formulation.⁴³⁰ For Paul, the fulfilment of the Law is meeting its true demands, which is "the *result* of Christian living *the norms of which are stated in quite different terms*," rather than a function of Law observance (*italics* Westerholm's).⁴³¹ This idea is at the heart of Paul's contention, as Bruce summarises:

The law of love (v 14) has the same construction as the statutes of the decalogue and of the Torah in general, but it is a different kind of law. No external force or sanction can compel the loving of a neighbour as oneself; such love must be generated from within—by the Spirit.⁴³²

427. Westerholm, "On Fulfilling," 233–34.

428. Ibid.

429. Barclay, *Obedience*, 139.

430. Cf. *B. Sabbath* 31a; *Gen. Rab.* 24:7. Barclay judiciously argues, "[E]ven if the rabbis would have felt comfortable with all the *ingredients* of Paul's statement in 5:14, they would have registered strong objections to the *context* in which he made it. For, while urging that the love-command is the fulfilment of the law, Paul also instructs the Galatians that they should not take on the yoke of the law (5.1), that they do not live under it (5.18) and that they must on no account get circumcised (5.3-4)." Ibid., 135–36. Also: Martyn, *Galatians*, 515–18.

431. Westerholm, "On Fulfilling," 235. Westerholm opposes Sanders's view that "fulfill the law" was only with reference to "behavior within the Christian community." Sanders, *Paul, the Law*, 84.

Paul's language of fulfilment thus "implies a total realization and accomplishment of the Law's demand and dovetails neatly with Paul's argument earlier in the letter that God's purposes and promises had reached their fulfilment in Christ (Gal 4:4)."⁴³³ In Galatians then, Lev 19:18 is elevated as the key command that enables the Jesus-believers to respond to what the Mosaic Law in its entirety was requiring all along—a statement both remarkable and unprecedented in Jewish tradition.

5.2.2 Rom 13:8-10

A closely related, if more developed, use of Lev 19:18 is found in Rom 13:10. As in Gal 5:14, Rom 13:10 cites Lev 19:18, naming it the summary command that can fulfil the Law (νόμον πεπλήρωκεν).

8 Μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν· ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον νόμον πεπλήρωκεν. 9 τὸ γὰρ οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται [ἐν τῷ]· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. 10 ἡ ἀγάπη τῷ πλησίον κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται· πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη.

Owe no one anything, except to love one another; for the one *who loves another has fulfilled the law*. The commandments, "You shall not commit adultery; You shall not murder; You shall not steal; You shall not covet"; and any other commandment, are summed up in this word, "Love your neighbor as yourself." Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore, love is the fulfilling of the law.

The levitical love command comes into view at 13:8-10, which immediately follows Paul's exposition on the Christian response to civil authorities (13:1-7). Rom 13:1-7 concludes with the exhortation, ἀπόδοτε πᾶσιν τὰς ὀφειλάς

432. Bruce, *Galatians*, 243. Also, Fung, *Galatians*, 247.

433. Barclay, *Obedience*, 139.

("Pay to all what is due to them"; v.7). Rom 13:8-10 bears the final references to νόμος in the book, following his relatively negative treatment of the Law in 10:4-5. The fact that Paul's last statement on the Law in Romans concerns the fulfilment of the Law through Lev 19:18 indicates his ardent concern for the Law and its place in salvation history.⁴³⁴ The theme of τὰς ὀφειλάς ('dues, obligation') at v.8 formulates negatively what he stated in v.7. This creates a smooth transition that extends the civil-economic language of 13:1-7, although the topic under discussion is now tied back to the topic of sincere love in 12:3-13, or more broadly 12:9-21.⁴³⁵ Moo observes, "These verses therefore return to the 'main line' of Paul's exhortation after the somewhat parenthetical advice about government in 13:1-7."⁴³⁶ Bencze demonstrates the rhythmic, chiasmic structure of 13:8-10 as follows:⁴³⁷

- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| A | B | |
| 1. Μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε | | εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν. |
| B | | A |
| 2. ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον | | νόμον πεπλήρωκεν. |
| A | | |
| 3. τὸ γὰρ | οὐ μοιχεύσεις, | |
| | οὐ φονεύσεις, | |
| | οὐ κλέψεις, | |
| | οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή, | |

434. Tomson contends, taking his cue from Albert Schweitzer, that Paul accepted "pluriformity" of halakha: "Galatians shows what happens if the fundamental pluriformity is violated to the detriment of gentiles, and Romans if it concerns Jews." Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, 265.

435. N. T. Wright, "The Letter to the Romans," in *The New Interpreter's Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002), X:724. Fitzmyer asserts that Paul "makes use of oxymoron, for love cannot be 'owed' like a debt." Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB 33 (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 677.

436. Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 811. Also, in Rom 13:8-10, "Paul lays groundwork for his rebuke of the strong and the weak (14:1-15:13)." Ibid.

437. Anselm L. Bencze, "An Analysis of 'Romans XIII. 8-10'," *NTS* 20 (1973): 90-92.

B

|| ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται
ἐν τῷ· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

BA

4. ἡ ἀγάπη τῷ πλησίον || κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται.

AB

5. πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου || ἡ ἀγάπη.

As Bencze observes, the A clauses contain the word νόμος, the “basic principle for the existence of human laws” (1.A) or “a basic law that sums up former verbal phrases” (4.A), while the B clauses consistently contain ἀγάπη in the substantival or verbal form.⁴³⁸ This grammatical structure skilfully stresses the connexion between love and the Law, underlining the idea that “A equals B” and vice versa.⁴³⁹ In v.8 Paul declares that those who believe in Christ are not to owe anything to anyone—εἰ μὴ love.⁴⁴⁰ The εἰ μὴ clause could be construed adversatively (“do not owe, *but rather*”), but its sense in the context seems to be the inclusive sense (“do not owe, *except*”), as most exegetes maintain.⁴⁴¹ Paul melds the metaphors of owing with that of loving rather than pits these ideas against each other and emphasises the ongoing obligation of Jesus-believers to love one another. While the love of God is not mentioned, Rom 12-13 assumes it to be fundamental to every Christian

438. Ibid., 91.

439. Ibid.

440. Jewett observes that the structure here follows “the pattern of ‘antilogical *γνώμαι*’ found in classical Greek collections.... ‘Owe to no one’ is a conventional expression for monetary or social indebtedness.” Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary*, Hermeneia 59 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 805.

441. Cranfield points out the difficulty with this former reading. C. E. B. Cranfield, *Commentary on Romans IX-XVI and Essays*, vol. 2 in *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979), 674; Jewett, *Romans*, 805; James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, WBC 38B (Waco, TX: Word, 1988), 776. For Hellenistic, parallel expressions of “a conventional expression for monetary or social indebtedness” employed in Rom 13:8-10, see Adolf Strobel’s work listed in Jewett, *Romans*, 805; also: BDAG 743.

imperative.⁴⁴² The obligation to love one another “inheres in what *God* has done, in the new life he has granted the believer in Christ” (italics Furnish’s).⁴⁴³ Or, as Dunn puts it, the love of neighbour here is “not merely an obligation but a responsive obligation, an obligation which arises from what those addressed have received.”⁴⁴⁴ The meaning of ἀλλήλους (‘each other’) has likewise attracted some discussion. While most agree that ἀλλήλους in this context refers to the intra-Christian relationship—perhaps even specifically to the Roman church—it is not clear how inclusive or exclusive Paul meant the definition of a neighbour to be.⁴⁴⁵

On the one hand, the majority of scholars detect an open, perhaps even universal, stance in the definition of the neighbour. For instance, Cranfield points out that while the restrictive sense of ἀλλήλους is possible, the antithesis μηδενὶ μηδέν makes this unlikely. He reasons that if “no one” in “owe to no one” encompasses both fellow Jesus-believers and non-believers, then the object of the qualifier “except to love” should likewise be applied to everyone.⁴⁴⁶ Dunn also thinks that even if fellow believers are in view here, ἀλλήλους is still “not in any exclusive way” and it “embraces all with whom

442. Spicq, *Agape*, II:58; Furnish, *The Love Command*, 110.

443. Ibid., 109.

444. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 776.

445. One issue that has regained scholarly attention in the recent years for Romans (*mutatis mutandis* Galatians) is the occasion and the encoded audience/reader of the letter. Some scholars advance the theory of all-gentile readership. Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews and Gentiles* (New Haven: YUP, 1994); Neil Elliott, *The Rhetoric of Romans: Argumentative Constraint and Strategy and Paul’s Dialogue with Judaism*, JSNTSup 45 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990); A. Andrew Das, *Solving the Romans Debate* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007). Esler challenges the facile use of “Jews versus Gentile” from a social-scientific angle, noting that “identity” and “ethnicity” are remarkably plastic categories that need to be used with greater precision. Philip F. Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans*, Biblical Studies (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 10-13.

446. Cranfield, *Romans 9-16*, 674-75. Moo follows. Moo, *Romans*, 813. Before Cranfield, Spicq already made a similar point. Spicq, *Agape*, II:57.

the Roman Jesus-believers would come in contact.”⁴⁴⁷ Those who advocate the more inclusive view of the neighbour tend to render the grammatical relationship of the ensuing phrase τὸν ἕτερον as the object of ὁ ἀγαπῶν. But even if one took τὸν ἕτερον as the object of love (i.e., ‘the other [person]’), the scope is still not apparent.⁴⁴⁸ Cranfield and Dunn see that the definite article before ἕτερον “has a generalizing effect” and that a neighbour is someone “whom God presents to one as one’s neighbour by the circumstances of his being someone whom one is in a position to affect for good or ill.”⁴⁴⁹ Dunn represents this line of thinking:

The call to love the other is in fact limited to the neighbor. This still does not involve a restriction by physical proximity or ethnic acceptability, but it does not broaden the outreach of love to everyone. The neighbor is the person encountered in the course of daily life who has a need which lays claim to the believer’s resources—a claim, it should also be said,

447. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 776. Moo concurs with Dunn. Moo, *Romans*, 813. Furnish also contends that the command to love is “in no way limited, either in its inclusiveness or in its duration.” Furnish, *The Love Command*, 110.

448. However, Marxsen, followed by Leenhardt, challenges this majority opinion and proposes that τὸν ἕτερον modifies the following noun νόμον, generating the phrase τὸν ἕτερον νόμον (‘the other law’). Willi Marxsen, “Der ἕτερος Νόμος Röm. 13,8,” *TZ* 11 (1955): 230-37; Franz J. Leenhardt, *L’épître de Saint Paul aux Romains*, CNT 6 (Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1957), 190. This “other law,” they argue, refers to the Mosaic Law in contrast with the civil law of Rome: “Es geht hier also um den staatlichen Bereich, um seine Gesetze, um die bürgerlichen Verpflichtungen.” Marxsen, “ἕτερος Νόμος,” 236. Others take the opposition as the rest of the law, or even the Double Love Command contrasted with the OT law, or the commandment of love of neighbour as opposed to the love of God. These proposals have mustered little support. Cranfield thinks Marxsen’s proposal is unlikely given that “there has been no clear reference to any law in the preceding sentences—the word νόμος itself has not been used since 10.5—is surely decisive.” Cranfield, *Romans 9-16*, 675-76. Cranfield also points out that Paul does not use ἀγαπᾶν “absolutely” (intransitively?) elsewhere. *Ibid.* Most scholars concur with Cranfield. See: Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 678; Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer*, HNT 8 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1974), 345; Moo, *Romans*, 813; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 776-77. Spicq thinks the lack of the article before νόμος signifies that it “refers to a rule of life or principle of Christian morality, and not to the Mosaic Law.” Spicq, *Agape*, II:57.

449. Cranfield, *Romans 9-16*, 676. Similarly, in Dunn’s words, τὸν “is important as particularizing the obligation.” Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 776.

which can never be regulated or limited by rules or code of practice and that often has an unexpected quality for which no forward planning is possible. And it calls for an actual output of love in action. But it is also in effect limited by the qualification 'as yourself'. The call is not to a love which would, if words mean anything, go far beyond the resources of any individual. A realistic self-esteem recognizes limits to what may be said or done on one's behalf, does not dissipate vital energies in a wide range of involvement which stretches personal resources too far and too thinly.⁴⁵⁰

On the other hand, Jewett suggests a much narrower scope. He argues that the phrase "one another" in Romans consistently refers only to fellow believers (1:12; 12:5, 10, 16; 14:13, 19; 15:5, 7, 14; 16:16) and repudiates the inclusivist reading. Despite his opposition to the traditional paradigm of "Jews" versus "non-Jews" and his emphasis on "neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free," Paul nonetheless maintains a new framework that clearly distinguishes those "within" and "outside" of the church.⁴⁵¹ Although disagreement abounds, Jewett concurs with Dunn in emphasising the "fulfillable" nature of Lev 19:18:

There is no indication in any of Paul's reference to love that it was a boundless and thus impossible burden. That misconception is due to the social decontextualization of Paul's ethic in the mainstream of the interpretative tradition, replacing it with elaborate intellectual constructs that have boundless implications and hence contain the convenient corollary of never being capable of actualization.⁴⁵²

450. Jewett, *Romans*, 782.

451. Montefiore also sees a more limited scope in Paul's conception of a neighbour: "Paul's image of neighbourliness was a redeemed Christian community." Montefiore, "Thou Shalt Love," 161.

452. Jewett, *Romans*, 807.

As an alternative solution, Jewett designates the agape meal as the specific and concrete historical situation which Paul has in view.⁴⁵³ For Jewett, Paul's exhortation to love and not to wrong each other should be read only against this socio-cultural backdrop. As ingenious as Jewett's social contextualisation is, his proposal is perhaps somewhat too narrow and neat. Even if Paul did have the agape meal setting in mind, this does not preclude the possibility that he also meant the reader to infer the far-reaching implication of the love of neighbour.⁴⁵⁴ In fact, Tsuji makes a good case that Rom 13 is framed by Rom 12:14-18, which seems to be Paul's reworking of the command to love one's enemies.⁴⁵⁵ Paul seems to connect his citation of Lev 19:18 with the love of enemies (i.e., those outside the church in Paul's case). If Tsuji is right, then despite Paul's consistent choice of ἀλλήλους as a reference to those within the church, his conception of neighbourly love may extend beyond those within the church.⁴⁵⁶

Shifting our focus back to Rom 13:8-10, an explanatory clause with γὰρ appears next. Paul lists the first four prohibitions from the LXX of Exod 20:13-17 and Deut 5:17-21 (prohibition of adultery, murder, theft and coveting), although the order of the first two commands are different.⁴⁵⁷ Lest

453. Jewett, *Romans*, 813-15. Jewett makes much of the definite article ἡ before the two occurrences of love in 13:10, arguing that Paul consciously sustains his argument about *the* love (feast): "In effect, Paul is claiming that the final goal of law, in whatever culture or family it manifests itself, is achieved in the love feasts of early Christian communities." Ibid., 815.

454. Ibid., 807.

455. Tsuji, *The Beginning*, 88-97. Tsuji observes that Rom 12:14-18 draws on Jesus' command to "love your enemies" (Matt 5:44; Luke 6:28), although several passages from the HB (i.e., Deut 32:35; Prov 12:19-21; 25:21-22) and other Jewish literature from the Second Temple period (i.e., CD 9:2-5; T. Joseph 18:2; T. Ben 4:2-3) could also serve as the backdrop of Rom 12:14-18. Ibid., 94.

456. Ibid., 95-97.

457. Dunn make a compelling case that Rom 13:9 reflects the order of the commandments that was widely known in the diaspora since it accords with the order found in the LXX B of

the reader may infer that only these four commands are relevant to Paul's argument, he also adds a generalising statement *καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή* ("and any other command"). Not only these four "ethical" commands of the Decalogue but any and every command is fulfilled in a single commandment. Whatever Paul's motivation in choosing these four specific commands, their enumeration reassures the reader that Paul considers specific stipulations (each commandment of the Law) as something vitally important.⁴⁵⁸ As in Gal 5:13-14, Paul's choice of the fulfilment language here is deliberate. He employs *πληρῶ* twice, in v.8 (*πεπλήρωκεν*) and v.10 (*πλήρωμα*), with reference to the Law.⁴⁵⁹ A parallel phrase *ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται*, which is flanked by the fulfilment language, also reveals Paul's thought. The association of *ἀνακεφαλαιοῦ* with the fulfilment words coheres nicely with the sense of *ἀνακεφαλαιοῦ* in Eph 1:10, which is the only other occurrence of this word in NT. The commands that Paul adduces are "summed up" or "brought together" in the love of neighbour, or as Spicq would have it, "uniting several things around a single principal point as axis, center, or principle of harmony."⁴⁶⁰ Yet again, in what way does the love of neighbour fulfil the Law? The critical issue at this juncture is whether the levitical love command "replaces these commandments or whether it simply

Deut 5, the Nash papyrus (pre-Christian, from Egypt—see IDB 3:510), Philo, *Decal* 36, 51, 121–37, 168–71; *SpecLeg* 3.8; Luke 18:20; Jas 2:11; and Clement, *Strom* 6.16 (also omitting the ninth command). Dunn, *Romans* 9-16, 777. Also: Berger, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu*, 275-77. Once again, Jewett thinks, "The four commandments that Paul selects would have been particularly relevant for life in the urban environment of Rome, where interpersonal relations, especially in the slums where most of the Christian cells were located, were tense, volatile, and full of temptations and provocations." Jewett, *Romans*, 810.

458. Dunn, *Romans* 9-16, 782.

459. Again, the law here most certainly refers to the Mosaic law, given the enumerated injunctions from the Decalogue.

460. Spicq, *Agape*, II:59.

focuses them by setting forth a demand that is integral to each one of them” (italics Moo’s).⁴⁶¹ On the one hand, Dunn thinks “fulfil” has the sense of “properly perform” based on his idea of covenantal nomism, as does Furnish.⁴⁶² On the other hand, Moo observes that while Paul could be “highlighting the centrality of love *within* the law,” it is more likely in the light of Rom 6:14, 15; 7:4; 8:4 (cf. Gal 6:2; 1 Cor. 9:19-21) that Paul is “thinking about a complete and final ‘doing’ of the law that is possible only in the new age of eschatological accomplishment.”⁴⁶³ Esler also contends that the idea of fulfilment has nothing to do with performance of the Law. Fulfilling the Law means that achieving “the ideal of the Mosaic law, which was, however, never realized by that law. Someone who has faith in Christ is thus able to obtain the best that the law promised, although never delivered, but by an entirely different route [i.e., the Spirit].”⁴⁶⁴ This point has already been taken up above in our discussion of Gal 5:13-14, but suffice it to say πληρώω seems to have the sense of “accomplish through the Spirit what God formerly intended through the Law” in Romans.

Finally, Paul adds yet another reason why the love of neighbour fulfils the Law in v.10: love does no wrong (κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται) to a neighbour. The subject subtly shifts from ὁ ἀγαπῶν (*‘the one who love’*) to ἡ ἀγάπη (*‘[the] love’*)

461. Moo, *Romans*, 816.

462. Dunn says, “But what the Judaism of Paul’s time sought was the keeping or performing of the law (including the provision of atonement), not some ideal of sinless perfection.... The dispute between Paul and his fellow Pharisees therefore was about what fulfillment = performance of the law really involves....” Dunn, *Romans* 9-16, 777. Furnish says, the expression “has fulfilled the law” in Rom 13:8b means “nothing more than ‘has resolved to do it’ (cf. Rom 2:13).” Furnish, *The Love Command*, 110.

463. Moo, *Romans*, 814-17.

464. Esler, *Conflict and Identity*, 335.

itself at this point.⁴⁶⁵ Here, Paul negatively formulates his statement at v.8b, viz., to love one's neighbour is to do no wrong to him/her.

A = A' ≠ B = B'	A Love of neighbour
	B adultery, murder, theft, coveting
	B' wronging the neighbour
	A' Fulfilment of the Law

Considering the above, Spicq's following summary is quite fitting:

To be faithful to the unique precept of agape is to accomplish the essential element of God's will, to be in tune with the entire moral legislation, to be a perfect Christian.... To love one's neighbor is to accomplish the entire Law; on this one point, the Christian can 'fulfill' all his moral and religious obligations of obedience to God.⁴⁶⁶

5.2.3 Interim summary: love as "fulfilment of the Law"

This section has examined two key passages in which Paul cites Lev 19:18. The foregoing analysis reveals two particular features in Paul's use of Lev 19:18.

First, Paul makes the summary function of the levitical love command more explicit than any other writer considered thus far. Regardless of how Paul conceived the function of the Law as it relates to other soteriological questions (e.g., justification, sanctification), that he pits the Mosaic Law / Covenant in its entirety against faith/love and the Spirit is clear. Paul speaks of the Law in largely negative terms, accentuating the fact that those who are "under the Law" ought to keep all of its precepts. The question of Paul's own

465. Furnish thinks v.10 is "a kind of *litotes*." Furnish, *The Love Command*, 111.

466. Spicq, *Agape*, II:42-43.

Jewish practices following his conversion as well as whether or not and to what extent he would have encouraged or required the Jewish and Gentile Jesus-believers to adopt Jewish customs remain unsolved by the present study. Nevertheless, it is clear that Paul reckons “faith working through love” (Gal 5:6; *πίστις δι’ ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη*) as what truly counts in Christ for those who have been freed from the Law and its yoke of slavery. The Spirit manifests itself in, among other things, love (Gal 5:22-23), which is also the culmination of, or the principle that ties together (*ἀνακεφαλαιόω*), all the commandments revealed in the Mosaic Law.

Second, the love of neighbour not only summarises the precepts of the Law, it also goes far beyond it to “fulfil” it. The ambiguity associated with the language of fulfilling has generated voluminous literature on this question, but what is unambiguous and remarkable is that the levitical love command is not only the first and the foremost of all the commandments (as in Mark; see below) or the crucial starting point that orientates one towards the proper Torah interpretation (as in R. Hillel and R. Akiba), but the love of neighbour is the true outworking of faith, the way of the Spirit that enables one to meet the demand of the Mosaic Law in its entirety. For Jesus-believers to whom the Spirit has been given, it is not through the observance of individual Mosaic precepts (however important this may have been for Jewish Jesus-believers; cf. Rom 9:4-5) but through the practice of the love of neighbour that they were enabled to realise the very ideals of the Mosaic Law. Perhaps, Spicq captures this well: “Whenever St. Paul prescribes love of neighbor (cf. 1 Thes. 4:9; 1 Cor. 12:31 ff.), he praises it to a remarkable degree.

It is the greatest of all the gifts of grace; it is the one way surpassing all others; it is God's direct teaching to his children."⁴⁶⁷

5.3 The Jamesian love of neighbour

The analysis now turns to Jas 2:8 where the the LXX-Lev 19:18b is once again quoted verbatim without the reference to the love of God:⁴⁶⁸ Εἰ μέντοι νόμον τελεῖτε βασιλικὸν κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε· ('You do well if you really fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself"). Jas 2:8 names the love of neighbour as the "royal law" in a section that deals with the issue of partiality (προσωποληψία) in the church (2:1-13).⁴⁶⁹ As this passage (2:1-13) is usually considered to be a literary unit, the contextual meaning and the

467. Ibid., 38.

468. The issues of authorship, date, and provenance are interconnected and difficult to surmise for James. Those who think James of Jerusalem the brother of Jesus wrote the letter naturally place the composition prior to his execution by Annas the Younger (ca. 62 CE), while others who think the letter is pseudepigraphal place the origin of the letter much later and argue for various places of origins. See: Rainer Riesner, "James," in *OBC* (Oxford: OUP, 2007), 1255-57; Paul A. Holloway, "The Letter of James," in *The Blackwell Companion to the New Testament*, ed. David E. Aune (West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, 2010), 571-72; Matti Myllykoski, "James the Just in History and Tradition: Perspectives of Past and Present Scholarship (Part I)," *CurBR* 5 (2006): 73-122; Maren R. Niehoff, "The Implied Audience of the Letter of James," in *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity*, ed. Gary Anderson, Ruth Clements, David Satran, *STDJ* 106 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 57-77. On the issue of James' textual dependence on the Gospel tradition, see: Patrick J. Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, LNTS (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991); Richard Bauckham, *James: Wisdom of James, Disciple of Jesus the Sage*, New Testament Readings (London: Routledge, 1999). On the question of whether James should be regarded as a "real" letter or an "epistle," see: Wesley Hiram Wachob, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James*, *SNTSMS* 106 (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), 2-8. For reception of James, see: David Gowler, *James Through the Centuries*, Wiley-Blackwell Bible Commentaries (Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, 2013).

469. The LXX uses the term προσωποληψία to translate the Hebrew expression פנים + נשא ('lift [one's] face'), which is found in Lev 19:15. See: Ralph P. Martin, *James*, WBC 48 (Waco, TX: Word, 1988), 59.

function of Lev 19:18b must be understood with the whole passage in mind. At the outset of this section, I will frame the discussion by noting a useful observation of Johnson and Bauckham regarding the place of Lev 19 in James. Then, I will conduct a broad-brush exegetical analysis of Jas 2:1-13. Finally, I will summarise this section and highlight James’ reception of the levitical love command.

5.3.1 Leviticus 19 in James

Before considering the citation of Lev 19:18 in Jas 2:8, it is instructive to note James’ use of Lev 19:11-18.⁴⁷⁰ Leviticus, particularly ch.19, was clearly of import for James. He not only cites the levitical love command but also skilfully interweaves various themes of Lev 19:11-18 into his letter. Johnson and Bauckham propose the following allusions to Lev 19:

<i>Leviticus</i>	<i>James</i>
19:12 Swearing falsely	5:12 Swearing
19:13 Defraud the neighbour/labours	5:4 Defrauded labourers
19:15 Impartial judgment	2:1, 9 Favouritism, partiality
19:16 Go around as a slander	4:11 Speaking evil
19:17b Open reproof	5:20 Bringing back a sinner
19:18a Vengeance, a grudge	5:9 Grumbling

To this list, the following may be added:

19:12b Profane YHWH’s name	2:7 Blaspheme the excellent name
----------------------------	----------------------------------

470. Johnson and Bauckham demonstrate this point at length. Luke Timothy Johnson, “The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James,” *JBL* 101 (1982): 391–401; Bauckham, *James*, 143.

Admittedly, some of these may be alluding to other OT passages (e.g., Jas 5:4 could be drawing on Deut 24:14 or Mal 3:5 instead of Lev 19:13) and some connexions are more tenuous than others. However, the high concentration of interrelated themes of Lev 19:12-18 are scattered throughout James (i.e., the “cluster” effect), which makes it unlikely that this was accidental.⁴⁷¹ Seen in this light, James is clearly interweaving the ethical injunctions of Lev 19:11-18 into his letter. Johnson argues:

The text of Leviticus did not guide the order of his exposition, nor did it, by any means, exhaustively dictate the contents of his message. But the clear thematic connections, together with the formal characteristics involving law, judgment and prohibition shared by many of these passages, point this way: that James regarded the “Royal Law” by which Christians were to live, and the “Law of Liberty” by which they were to be judged, as explicated concretely and specifically not only by the Decalogue (2:11), but by the immediate context of the Law of Love, the commands found in Lev 19:12-18.⁴⁷²

Bauckham further explores this key connexion. He insightfully observes that the allusion to Lev 19 forms the “very beginning of the main, expository section of James (2:1)” and marks the “end of the very end (5:20).”⁴⁷³ In other words, Lev 19:12-18 frames the entire expository section of James, and the citation of Lev 19:18 is crowned as the “royal” law. Furthermore, Bauckham points out the uniqueness of James’ appropriation of Lev 19:11-18. He observes that “what emerges as distinctively Christian” in James is how he seemed to have read “specific commands in the light of the teaching of Jesus”

471. Johnson, “The Use,” 394.

472. Ibid., 399.

473. It may not be farfetched to regard the love command as the central command or principle of the whole letter, although there is no space to explore this point in this thesis.

(cf. Jas 4:11 = Matt 7:1, Luke 6:37; Jas 5:9 = Matt 7:1-2, Luke 6:37; Jas 5:12 = Matt 5:33-37).⁴⁷⁴ Accordingly, although Lev 19:18 is not combined with Deut 6:5, the love of God nevertheless seems to be implicit in James' treatment of the love of neighbour. James twice refers to the Shema (2:19; 4:12) and to eschatological reward as promised by God to "those who love him" (1:12; 2:5). His critique of the "double-mindedness" (1:8; 4:8) seems to evoke the marked antithesis of the call to love God with all of one's heart and soul. The *Shema* must have been so axiomatic for James that he sees this as the truest form of religion (*θρησκεία*)—a term which normally refers to the cultic service of God but applied to "bridling the tongue, caring for the poor, and not being influenced by the values of the dominant society" in James.⁴⁷⁵ Whatever the reason for the absence of the explicit citation of the Double Love Command tradition, James seems to hold the love of God and the love of neighbour closely in the letter.

5.3.2 Jas 2:1-13 in context

The citation of Lev 19:18 may now be studied in context. In the preceding verse (1:27), James has just characterised the true religion "that is pure and undefiled before God, the Father" (*καθαρά καὶ ἀμίαντος παρὰ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ*) as caring for those in distress and keeping oneself "untainted" or "uncontaminated" (*ἄσπιλον*) by the world. Now he transitions into 2:1-13 where he deals with the issue of partiality within the church. The structure of Jas 2:1-13 can be divided into three main sections, [i] vv.1-4, [ii] vv.5-7, and [iii] vv.8-13, which may be further subdivided as below:⁴⁷⁶

474. Bauckham, *James*, 145.

475. *Ibid.*, 146.

476. Martin Dibelius, *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, trans. Michael A.

v.1	Opening: favouritism and faith in Christ
vv.2-4	Illustration: the poor vs. the rich
vv.5-7	Rhetorical questions: grounding of admonition
vv.8-11	Scriptural quotation and application
vv.12-13	Conclusion: eschatological judgment

Jas 2:1 opens a new section with a rhetorical question that intimates that the acts of partiality are incompatible with the true faith.⁴⁷⁷ Vv.2-4 illustrates James' assertion in v.1, and these verses form one of the longest sentences in James. The compound protasis (vv.2-3) introduces two antithetical characters, i.e., a rich man (ἀνὴρ χρυσοδακτύλιος ἐν ἐσθῇτι λαμπρᾷ: 'a man with a golden ring and in fine clothes') and a poor man (πτωχὸς ἐν ῥυπαρᾷ ἐσθῇτι: 'poor in dirty clothes'), and the apodosis (v.4) is formed by a rhetorical question with two parallel ideas, viz., "make distinction" (διεκρίθητε)⁴⁷⁸ and "to become judges with evil thoughts (ἐγένεσθε κριταὶ διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν)."⁴⁷⁹ Two interrelated issues ought to be considered here. The first is the meaning of συναγωγὴν (v.2). Three main proposals have been put forward: [i] the Christian community itself, [ii] a (Jewish) synagogue building with Christian attendance, or [iii] a Christian assembly or gathering. The second issue is the identity of the rich and the poor. Who are the rich who come *into your* (plural) συναγωγή? That James equates the poor with the messianic

Williams, *Hermeneia* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), 124–48; Wachob, *The Voice*, 63; Scot McKnight, *The Letter of James*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 173; Dale C. Allison Jr, *James: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, ICC (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 374–75.

477. The age-old question of whether τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου should be rendered as an objective (i.e., faith in the Lord) or subjective (i.e., the faith that the Lord possesses) genitive persists. Most opt for the objective sense (e.g., Ropes, Dibelius, Allison, McKnight), but others favour the subjective sense (Wachob, Hartin). Also, the occurrence of the phrase τῆς δόξης is rare.

478. Dibelius, *James*, 136–37.

479. Wachob, *The Voice*, 73.

community(-ies) to which his letter is addressed is clear, but the identity of the rich remains uncertain. Allison summarises the four possibilities: [i] rich Christians, [ii] interested non-Christian visitors, [iii] well-to-do Jewish members of the synagogue, and [iv] indeterminable and a matter of exegetical indifference.⁴⁸⁰ The answers to these issues are interconnected, and a wide array of suggestions have been offered. For instance, Hort thinks *συναγωγή* refers to the building ('[place of] assembly') where both the rich and the poor Christians were gathered.⁴⁸¹ Ropes posits that the rich were visitors ("outsiders whether Jews or Gentiles") to a Christian meeting.⁴⁸² Laws likewise believes the rich were visitors to "a meeting of Jews or Jewish Christian."⁴⁸³ Ward, followed by Hartin, argues that vv.2-4 is best understood in a judicial context where the parties involved are both members of the community.⁴⁸⁴ Adamson also follows Ward in thinking that these courts were "probably the local Jewish sanhedrin ... in every village, with a High Court in Jerusalem."⁴⁸⁵ Others advance a different type of solution. Dibelius, followed by Davids, contends that Jas 2:1-13 is highly stylised and written with a "paraenetic intention" that it "cannot be used as a historical source for actual circumstances within the Christian communities."⁴⁸⁶ Although

480. Allison, *James*, 376–78.

481. F. J. A. Hort, *The Epistle of St James* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1909), 48–49.

482. James H. Ropes, *The Epistle of St James*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1916), 189–91. Ropes opines, "The rich are plainly neighbours who do not belong to the conventicle but may sometimes condescend to visit it." Ropes, *James*, 197.

483. Sophie Laws, *The Epistle of James*, BNTC (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1980), 99–101.

484. Roy Bowen Ward, "Partiality in the Assembly: James 2:2-4," *HTR* 62 (1969): 87–97; Hartin, *James and Q*, 118. Ward also sees a distinction between the "man with the golden ring" in v.2 and the "rich" (a term always reserved to outsiders) in vv.5-7.

485. James B. Adamson, *The Epistle of James*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 105–6, 108, 111.

486. Dibelius, *James*, 128–30; Peter H. Davids, *The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Paternoster Press, 1982), 107–8.

Dibelius is right to note that Jamesian account is carefully stylised—for polemical accounts as such are by nature stylised, especially in their depiction of the foes—his position is not without drawbacks.⁴⁸⁷ However stylised the illustration may be, the discourse must have bore, as Laws puts it, “some relation to his readers’ experience, and portray a situation which either has or could obtain for them” in order for James’ argument to have any real rhetorical force.⁴⁸⁸ James does not use vv.2-4 as a purely hypothetical illustration to make a general point; rather, “he offers it as proof, as the compelling social basis for what he says.”⁴⁸⁹ Laws’s reasoning seems cogent, since the force of the author’s ensuing rebuke (vv.6-7) would be diminished if vv.2-4 were purely theoretical. Whatever the precise historical circumstance lies behind this illustration and however stylised this account may be, the illustration must have been grounded enough in a real-life situation that was readily recognisable by the reader.⁴⁹⁰

The familiar Jamesian vocative “my dear brothers” (ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί) signals a break at v.5, and vv.5-7 further develops the argument. God’s selection of the poor over against the rich further undergirds the culpability of the community’s action.⁴⁹¹ The poor of the world (τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ)⁴⁹² who fare very well in James are described in three ways: [a]

487. Hartin follows Dibelius on this issue. Patrick J. Hartin, *James*, SP 14 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003), 117–18.

488. Laws, *James*, 98; Wachob, *The Voice*, 76.

489. Ibid., 77.

490. Allison offers a compelling case for construing συναγωγὴν as a synagogue building and the gathering as a reference to a judicial convocation. Allison, *James*, 386–87.

491. Adamson rightly notes, “Not every rich man is doomed to be damned (e.g., Joseph of Arimathea, Mark 15:43–47), and not every poor man is sure to be saved; but for the purposes of this chapter there is a deep difference between the rich, in general, and the poor, in general, and there is, in general, an equation of the poor and the world’s despised.” Adamson, *James*, 108–9.

492. For various interpretative options for this dative construction τῷ κόσμῳ, see: Peter

πλουσίους ἐν πίστει ('rich in faith'), [b] κληρονόμους τῆς βασιλείας ('heirs of the kingdom'), and [c] τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν ('those who love him'). This positive description of the poor brings James' pithy and potent accusation of v.6a into sharp focus: God's treatment of the poor stands in stark contradiction with the way in which the community has treated them.⁴⁹³ Whereas God has chosen to side with and honour the poor, the community has done just the opposite: the community honoured the rich at the expense of the poor. Using a string of rhetorical questions once again, James now characterises the rich in three ways (vv.6b-7). The rich [a] oppress (καταδυναστεύουσιν), [b] drag the poor into court (αὐτοὶ⁴⁹⁴ ἔλκουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς κριτήρια), and [c] blaspheme the good name (αὐτοὶ βλασφημοῦσιν τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα). The oppression (καταδυναστεύω) carries the sense of abuse of power or economic exploitation of the poor, particularly by the rich and the powerful in the LXX (Ezek 18:12; 22:29; Amos 4:1; Zech 7:10).⁴⁹⁵ The rich who oppress the poor violate the prohibition of Lev 19:13 (cf. Lev 19:34). While the LXX normally translates the Hebrew verb רָשָׁע ('oppress, exploit'; e.g., Jer 21:12; Deut 28:29; 1 Sam 12:4; Hos 4:2) with a Greek term ἀδικέω ('deal unjustly'; cf. Lev 6:2, 4), which has a broader semantic range, James chooses καταδυναστεύω.⁴⁹⁶ Dibelius thinks this

Frick, "A Syntactical Note on the Dative τῷ κόσμῳ in James 2:5," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 17 (2004): 99–103. While most construe the phrase as dative of (dis)advantage ("in view / judgment of the world") or reference / respect ("with respect to") or sphere ("in the sphere of"), Frick thinks it is dative of instrument (i.e., "on account of," "because of").

493. Allison observes, "Whether or to what extent ἐκλέγομαι expressed a considered doctrine of election such as we find in the Dead Sea Scrolls and parts of Romans—cf. perhaps the βουλῆς of 1.18—cannot be answered. Yet the main point is clear: God shows a predilection for 'the poor' as opposed to the rich." Allison, *James*, 395.

494. Most scholars see this repetitive pronoun (αὐτοὶ) as a sign of Semitism, but Adamson thinks there is no need to posit a Semitic influence as it "has the emphasis of antithesis in contrast to the poor of Jas 2.5 and 6a." Adamson, *James*, 111.

495. Ropes, *James*, 195–96; Laws, *James*, 104; Allison, *James*, 398.

496. Wevers, *Notes on LXX Leviticus*, 297; Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17–22, 1636–37.

oppression specifically refers to the economic oppression of labourers, which is a subject that appears in Jas 5:4.⁴⁹⁷ This observation is likely given the fact that the oppression of Lev 19:13a—from which Jas 5:4 is probably derived—is connected to the prohibition of stealing (גזל; Lev 19:13b) and (or by) withholding of the hireling's wages (תלין פעלת שכיר; Lev 19:13c). The idea of “dragging someone into somewhere (ἔλκω + εἰς)” is found in several other NT passages (Matt 10:17-18; Mark 13:11; Luke 21:12-15; Acts 4:3, etc.).⁴⁹⁸ Most construe “dragging into courts” ([b]) as an act of legal oppression, perhaps a more specific instance of [a] καταδυναστεύω. In this case, the economic oppression stands as the backdrop of this legal oppression.⁴⁹⁹ The rich is also characterised as the one who blasphemes τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς (*‘the good name which has been called upon you’*). Allison observes that a clear parallel is found in Deut 28:10 (שם יהוה נקרא עליך), and the formulation, τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα, seems to refer to God's name (YHWH) in James rather than to the most common understanding, namely, Jesus Christ.⁵⁰⁰ Allison's suggestion is further corroborated by the observation that Lev 19:12 similarly proscribes the profaning of YHWH's name through swearing falsely. The accusation against the rich that they breach the law of Lev 19:12-13, which

497. Dibelius, *James*, 140. Milgrom also argues that Lev 19:13, in line with P's redactional intent, concerns legal exploitation. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1637.

498. Whether the court here refers to Jewish tribunals or Gentile courts is difficult to ascertain and once again hangs on one's view of the Sitz im Leben reflected in vv.2-4. Allison, *James*, 399.

499. Laws, *James*, 105. Martin, following Furfey, thinks it refers to “Jewish bankers who were using their Christian profession as an excuse to evade Torah's prohibitions [of putting legal pressures on the poor over such matters as debts, rents, wages, etc.] (Deut 23:19-20).” Martin, *James*, 66; Paul Hanly Furfey, “PLOUSIOS and Cognates in the New Testament,” *CBQ* 5 (1943): 241–63.

500. Allison, *James*, 399–400. However, many scholars take this as a reference to Jesus: Hartin, *James*, 120-21; Laws, *James*, 105-6 (baptismal name); Ropes, *James*, 196-97; Hort, *James*, 52-53; Adamson, *James*, 112-13.

prohibits the economic oppression of the vulnerable and profaning of the name of YHWH, effectively highlights their wickedness.

Then Lev 19:18 emerges in vv.8-9 where James instructs his readers. The contextual meaning of Lev 19:18b is revealed by the contrastive, conditional clauses of vv.8-9. This section yields a tightly knit structure: the A-B-C set (fulfilment of the royal law = loving one's neighbour) is sharply contrasted with the A'-B'-C' set (transgressing the law = showing partiality).

A	Εἰ μέντοι ⁵⁰¹ τελεῖτε	(if + emphatic particle)
B	νόμον βασιλικὸν κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν	(law + adverbial phrase)
	--> Quotation of Lev 19:18b	
C	καλῶς ποιεῖτε	(evaluation)
A'	εἰ δὲ προσωπολημπτεῖτε	(if + emphatic particle)
B'	ἐλεγχόμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου ὡς παραβάται	(law + adverbial phrase)
C'	ἁμαρτίαν ἐργάζεσθε	(evaluation)

The quotation of Lev 19:18b is integral to James' argument, making "explicit that showing partiality to the rich is not an issue of etiquette but a matter of Torah."⁵⁰² The term νόμος here is best understood as a reference to the whole Torah (as in Paul) rather than to any individual commandment. James always uses νόμος to refer to "the law in its unity and entirety (cf. Jas 1.25; 2.8, 9, 10, 11, 12; 4.11 [4x])."⁵⁰³ More difficult to ascertain are the questions of [i]

501. While μέντοι is used with an adversative sense "however" in other NT passages, it seems to have the force of "indeed" or "really" here. Although a handful of scholars maintain the adversative sense (Mayor, Davids), most see the emphatic sense. Ropes, *James*, 198; Laws, *James*, 107; Adamson, *James*, 114.

502. Allison, *James*, 401.

503. Wachob, *The Voice*, 92. Konradt also agrees: "The decisive argument for a summarizing function (as in Matthew) is that elsewhere in James νόμος always means the law as a whole, but never only a single commandment (Jas 1:25; 2:9-12; 4:11)." Matthias Konradt, "The Love Command in Matthew, James and the Didache," in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, ed. Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, SymS 45 (Atlanta: SBL, 2008), 278. Also: Ropes, *James*, 198; Dibelius,

how the citation of Lev 19:18 relates to the νόμος, and [ii] the meaning of the adjective βασιλικός ('royal/kingly'). As to the former, most exegetes see Lev 19:18 as either forming only a part (i.e., an example) of or being equal with the royal law. For instance, Dibelius asserts:

The commandment of love is not considered in our passage to be the chief commandment, in the sense of the famous saying of Jesus (Mark 12:31 par); instead, it is one commandment along side others [i.e., the prohibition of adultery and murder in v.11)....⁵⁰⁴

On the contrary, others make a better case for construing Lev 19:18 itself as the royal law. For example, Hort thinks the adjective "royal" applies to Lev 19:18b "since the precept itself was so comprehensive."⁵⁰⁵ Laws likewise

James, 144; Davids, *James*, 114; Bauckham, *James*, 142–47; Wachob, *The Voice*, 92; Douglas J. Moo, *The Letter of James*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 111–12; Dan G. McCartney, *James*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009), 147.

504. Dibelius, *James*, 142–43. According to Dibelius, the term "royal" signifies neither the idea of "emanating from Christ the King" nor "belonging to the Kingdom of God (= Christian law)," but James simply wants to present it as "important and unconditionally binding (that it is worthy to be kept by a king)" by decorating it as "the law with royal authority" or "the law which is set for kings." Furnish adopts, as does Tsuji, the same line of reasoning and argues, "Even if you keep all the (other) commandments of the law, but, by showing partiality to the rich, neglect the one commandment to love your neighbor (the poor brother), then you are in fact guilty under the whole law." Furnish, *The Love Command*, 179; Tsuji, *The Beginning*, 118. However, Furnish's assertion is illogical. One cannot even in theory keep "all the other commands" and break the love command simultaneously. If one shows partiality, then one has already broken specific prohibitions *other than* the love command (i.e., the prohibition against partiality, socio-economic oppression of the poor). In effect, the failure to keep the love command always implies the infringement of both the love command and other prohibitions (e.g., against partiality). By the same token, the natural corollary of keeping the love command is the fulfilment of other "ethical" commands of the Torah (e.g., supporting the poor and the needy, rebuking one's kinsfolk, etc.). Even if James were not equating the royal law with the love command, it still begs the question as to why James chose this very specific command from Lev 19. Even if Lev 19:18 were only a part (particular) of the royal law (universal), it was still surely regarded as the commandment *par excellence* among the instantiated particulars and hence Lev 19:18 occupies higher (chief) status than other commandments of the royal law.

505. Hort, *James*, 54.

equates Lev 19:18 with the royal law (where “royal” signals the Kingdom of God), and she advances a number of arguments:⁵⁰⁶

First, had James wished to weight the precept against discrimination alongside others it is again surprising that he does not cite Lev. xix. 15 itself.... Moreover, v. 10 marks a new stage in the thought of the epistle. The section vv. 1-9 focuses on the sin of discrimination, and reaches its climax when Lev. xix. 18 is invoked precisely against that sin. In v. 10 a new, albeit related, idea, that of keeping the law in its entirety, is introduced and discussed in its own terms. Certainly Lev. xix. 18 is not for James everything he means by law, but nor is it simply one command among others.... It is clearly important for James to bring his warning against discrimination into relation to this commandment, to show that it is comprehended within it, and he underlines the authority of the commandment with an honorific description. ...certainly if James is indicating the wide applicability of that precept, *teleō* could be argued to be the appropriate verb.⁵⁰⁷

To press this point further, James must have known that Lev 19:18 already functioned as a summary (albeit not as grandiose as in the NT) in Lev 19 itself.⁵⁰⁸ Considering how well acquainted with Lev 19 James was, it would be highly doubtful that he was unaware of the summarising function of Lev 19:18. In addition, considering the possibility that James was influenced by

506. Laws writes, “[W]hen James quotes Lev. xix. 18 as *scripture* he does so in the knowledge that this scripture has received the added authority of Jesus’ use. It is reasonable to suppose that the prominence of a command to love in many of the NT documents is due to its prominence in the teaching of Jesus, even when this is not explicitly acknowledged.” Laws, *James*, 110. Also: Franz Mußner, *Der Jakobusbrief. Auslegung*, HThKNT 13, Part 1 (Freiburg: Herder, 1987), 124; Martin, *James*, 67.

507. Laws, *James*, 108-9.

508. Sterling observes the routine appearance of Lev 19 in Jewish ethical instructions attested both in Hellenistic Diaspora sources and the Qumran scrolls. Gregory E Sterling, “Was There a Common Ethic in Second Temple Judaism?,” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001*, ed. John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth Clements (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 171–94.

Matthew (the Double Love Command tradition) and/or possibly by Paul in whose writings Lev 19:18 plays a decisive role, it is hard to imagine that James picked Lev 19:18 out of thin air.⁵⁰⁹ Even if James had no direct knowledge of either the Pauline letters or the Double Love Command tradition, the shared exegetical method in all these passages is far too similar to ignore some sort of dependence on a common tradition. One would be hard pressed not to assume that James knew, like the Gospel writers and especially Paul, of a tradition that elevated the love of neighbour as (part of) the command *par excellence*. Hence, it is much more reasonable to read Lev 19:18b as the royal law within which the following explication of Lev 19:15 finds its place. Be that as it may, as Laws concedes, the love command is probably not everything James meant by the Law. The most sensible interpretation seems to be to avoid the false dichotomy of “just one precept among many” or “everything the law signifies” and strike the middle ground as Allison does: “James seems to be writing about both part and whole simultaneously.”⁵¹⁰

Turning now to the latter issue, that is, to the meaning of βασιλικός in context, while the marked characterisation of the Law as “royal” clearly emphasises its importance, its precise nuance is not obvious.⁵¹¹ Allison thinks the adjective βασιλικόν could be describing the law as “given by or worthy of a king” or “law that is itself king,” based on some parallel expressions found

509. James probably knew the Jesus tradition, and it is possible that he knew Matthew (though this remains no more than a conjecture). On the possible influence of Matthew and/or Paul on James, see: Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, eds., *Matthew, James, and Didache*; Allison, *James*, 51-71.

510. *Ibid.*, 402-3.

511. Ruzer contends that the practice of characterising the law as “royal” is not new with James but conforms to the “pattern” of wider Jewish exegetical tradition. Serge Ruzer, “James on Faith and Righteousness in the Context of a Broader Jewish Exegetical Discourse,” in Anderson, Clements, and Satran, *New Approaches*, 88-96.

in Graeco-Roman sources.⁵¹² Others argue that it denotes the quintessence of the Law and render it as “supreme” or “pre-eminent” Law. Others contend that James knew the Matthean tradition and names the law as belonging to or as informed by “the kingdom of God.” Allison nicely summarises the hitherto proposed interpretative possibilities.⁵¹³

- [i] A roundabout way of stressing significance,
- [ii] the Torah as interpreted by and through Jesus,
- [iii] the law of the Kingdom of God,
- [iv] from and leads to the divine king (cf. Philo *Post.* 101-102),
- [v] its giver (i.e., God or Christ) is king,
- [vi] Torah obedience is to behave in regal fashion.

Once again, rather than limiting the word βασιλικόν to a single sense, James seems to have capitalised on its multivalency: “Writers can formulate things ambiguously because they wish to evoke as well as to explain.”⁵¹⁴

The fulfilment of the royal law is introduced and qualified by a citation formula (cf. 2:23; 4:5) κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν (‘according to the writing [i.e., the Scripture]’).⁵¹⁵ James here grounds his admonition in the scripture rather than in the words or tradition of Jesus. Johnson observes, “In this case, he means precisely the law of love as articulated by its scriptural context. One cannot claim to love while practicing favoritism in judging, for the prohibition of such favoritism is part of the law of love.”⁵¹⁶ Consonant with Paul’s conception (i.e., the whole law), vv.10-11 stresses the unity of the Torah.

512. Ibid., 402.

513. Ibid., 403-5.

514. Ibid., 405.

515. Wachob, *The Voice*, 92; Allison, *James*, 406.

516. Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Letter of James: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB 37A (New Haven: YUP, 2005), 236.

Johnson again observes, "[A]s in the case of Pseudo-Phocylides, James combines the reference to Leviticus 19 with a citation of part of the Decalogue."⁵¹⁷ James takes up another obvious example: the one who refrains from adultery but commits murder undoubtedly transgresses the Law. James wants to say, of course, that no matter what other merits vis-à-vis Torah observance the community may claim, their failure to love the poor and the vulnerable is surefire evidence that they are transgressing the whole Law—for one cannot selectively keep one command and ignore another.

V.12 emphasises that neighbourly love is a comprehensive undertaking. If one is to refrain from showing partiality, then it involves both "speaking" (λαλεῖτε) and "doing" (ποιεῖτε) according to "law of freedom" (νόμου ἐλευθερίας).⁵¹⁸ This Jamesian phrase has already appeared in 1:25 where the phrase "law of liberty" is used interchangeably with "perfect law." The perfect law or the law of freedom is equated with the "royal law" (2:10) in this section.⁵¹⁹ The contextual meaning becomes clear: the perfect law of freedom is the Torah as summarised by the Decalogue and further fulfilled by the practice of Lev 19:18. The preposition διὰ (+ genitive) in διὰ νόμου is probably the genitive of instrument or agency ("by means/agency of"), and "it here indicates the state or condition in which an action is performed; the *law of freedom*, cf. i. 25, is the framework or context within which they speak and

517. Johnson, "The Use," 393.

518. According to Allison, the construction οὕτως ... καὶ οὕτως is characteristic rendering for וכן ... כן in the LXX (cf. Num 2:34; Deut 22:3; Ps 34:14, etc.). Allison, *James*, 417.

519. Furnish, *The Love Command*, 180. Also, Martin, *James*, 71. Dibelius and Allison draw attention to possible influence of Stoicism, Hellenistic Judaism, and even Rabbinic Judaism on the idea of freedom from which this phrase may have been borrowed. Dibelius, *James*, 116-20; Allison, *James*, 334-45. Allison takes the "perfect law of freedom" as a reference to the "Torah in its entirety" rather than the gospel, as many exegetes assume, or some sort of principle in contradistinction from the Torah. *Ibid.*, 418.

act, as the future judgment will take account of that fact...."⁵²⁰ Finally, v.13 establishes a strong conceptual link between love and mercy. The last phrase *κατακαυχᾶται ἔλεος κρίσεως* ("Mercy triumphs over judgment") is somewhat perplexing, since it seems to weaken, if not contradict, the first part of v.13. If mercy triumphs over judgment, then the claim that one is required to keep the Law (via the love command) seems to become a moot point.

Commentators propose various solutions to explain this phenomenon. For instance, Dibelius thinks v.13 is disjointed from vv.1-12 and argues that it is "an isolated saying" that lends "no special support" to James' main line of argument.⁵²¹ V.13 may have been added later from an originally independent proverb or saying of some sort, given the sudden grammatical change from second to third person and the fact that similar statements are found in several Jewish sources (e.g., *T. Zeb* 5:3; *T. Abr* [Rec B.] 10).⁵²² However, *pace* Dibelius, v.13 is not thematically disjointed from vv.1-12, but rather it is integral to James' argument. The association of love and mercy is commonly found in biblical thought. The characterisation of God as merciful (Exod 34:5-6; Deut 4:31; Ps 103:8ff.), which forms the basis for the command that his people ought to show mercy (Jer 9:26; Hos 6:6; Mic 6:8), is well known. The teaching of Jesus likewise testifies to this close association (Matt 5:7; 12:7), especially the parable of the unmerciful servant (Matt 18:29, 34; 25:45-46).⁵²³ Furthermore, Davids contends that "the connection between forgiveness at the last judgment and one's having shown mercy was clearly stated long before James (*Sir.* 27:30-28:7; *Tob.* 4:9-11; cf. *Test. Zeb.* 8:3 and *b. Shab.*

520. Laws, *James*, 116. Cf. Allison, *James*, 418.

521. Dibelius, *James*, 147. Cf. Furnish, *The Love Command*, 178, n.36.

522. Dibelius, *James*, 147; Bauckham, *James*, 87-88; Allison, *James*, 423.

523. Davids, *James*, 118-19; Laws, *James*, 116-17.

151b...).⁵²⁴ Given James' own emphasis on showing care and mercy to the poor (cf. 1:27), the Jamesian command to love the neighbour is virtually synonymous with showing mercy to the neighbour. In James, "loving one's neighbor means showing mercy to the poor, and showing mercy to the poor means loving one's neighbor."⁵²⁵ It comes as no surprise then that James incorporates traditional material on mercy and judgment in the discussion of true neighbourly love. The point of v.13 is to stress the primacy of mercy, even if the precise connexion between mercy and divine justice in the final judgment remains opaque to the reader (and perhaps even to James himself). The closing statement of v.13 then functions in two ways:

One suspects (i) that James adopts the traditional sentiment, that divine mercy trumps divine justice, in order to convey that mercy is what matters most and (ii) that the imitatio dei is implicit: if mercy carries the day with God, it should carry the day with human beings.⁵²⁶

5.3.3 Interim summary: the "royal" law

James employs Lev 19:18 in the context of addressing a particular issue of partiality within the community. His use of Lev 19:18 exhibits a couple of interpretative features.

First, James names the levitical love command as "the royal law"—a phenomenon otherwise unattested in the NT. The precise sense of this adjective may be hard to pinpoint, since he seems to have deliberately chosen this multivalent expression. James tries to explain as well as evoke the

524. Davids, *James*, 119.

525. Allison, *James*, 419. This statement foreshadows the theme of faith and works in the ensuing section.

526. Ibid., 424.

supreme value of Lev 19:18 and its association with Jesus (who is king) and his teaching about the kingdom of God. Closely related is the fact that James treats the Law as a unity and in its entirety, as he equates the practice of Lev 19:18 with the fulfilment of the entire Torah.

Second, James places a singular emphasis on “doing,” that is, putting the neighbourly love into practice. The implementation of this love demands a comprehensive scope—not only with words and intentions but with deeds. Compared to Paul, James seems to be less interested in grand, theoretical expositions of love and the Law, but he wants to emphasise the love of neighbour to remedy a certain issue within the community. The weight placed on the act of providing for the poor (1:27; cf. 2:15-16) and the works of faith (2:14-26) makes it apparent that the love of neighbour in James is meant to be practiced in the concrete form of caring for the needy. In this sense, James’ use of the love of neighbour has a more direct, pedagogic import than that of Paul. Hence, while Paul and James use similar words to speak of the love of neighbour, James presses the point—in keeping with his emphasis on “being the doers of the word” (1:22-27) and perhaps in contrast to Paul—that Lev 19:18 is worthless unless practiced.⁵²⁷

Third, James ties mercy with love. So stark is the association of these two themes that they are virtually synonymous for him. The logic of James’ argument runs thus: to love one’s neighbour is to show no partiality in the community and to show mercy to the poor through providing for them. To

527. Martin Hengel has famously argued that James is a work that is consciously anti-Pauline polemic. Martin Hengel, “Der Jakobsbrief als antipaulinische Polemik,” in *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis for His 60th Birthday*, ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne and Otto Betz (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987), 248–78. Ruzer thinks this was unlikely: Ruzer, “James on Faith”, 90-96.

honour the poor and to provide for them is to practice the royal law (the love of neighbour), which in effect enables one to fulfil the Torah.

5.4 The love of neighbour in the Synoptic Gospels

The reception of the levitical love command in the Synoptic Gospels is extremely intriguing. No other reception of the levitical love command is as well-known as the Double Love Command tradition triply attested in Matt 22:34-40, Mark 12:28-34, and Luke 10:25-37. The now-indelible association of the deuteronomic love command (Deut 6:5) and the levitical love command (Lev 19:18) gives off the impression that this tradition was widespread in ancient Judaism. However, this is the first time anywhere in Jewish literature where these two commands are unmistakably set abreast as a unit and unequivocally labeled as the greatest command. However, tracing the historical genesis of the Double Love Command tradition in the Gospels and ascertaining its relation to other writing in the NT are not so straightforward.⁵²⁸ As aforementioned, even though the Synoptic Gospels were written probably later than James or Pauline letters, they may in fact preserve earlier traditions. Furnish states:

It would seem to be obvious that the teaching of Jesus himself must be the starting point for an investigation of the love command in earliest Christianity. But it is equally clear that Jesus' teaching is accessible only

528. Several passages are often cited as parallels in connexion with this issue: *T. 12 Patr.* (see Introduction), Qumran material (i.e., 4QTLevi, 4QTNaph, 4QTBenj), the Philonic conception of two great laws/virtues in (*De spec. leg.* 2.15, §63), along with other early Christian writings (Did. 1:2; Barn. 19:2,5; Justin, Dial, 93:2-3; Mart. Pol. 3:3). Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke X-XXIV: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AYB 28A (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 878-79.

in the traditions preserved and interpreted in the church's own teaching and preaching, and presented finally in the faith documents we know as "Gospels." Therefore, it is not with "Jesus in history" but with "Jesus in the Gospels" that our study must commence, whereupon it becomes immediately apparent that each of the evangelists has received and formulated Jesus' teachings on love in a distinctive way.... The gospels do not just exhibit Jesus' teaching, but rather receive, transmit, and apply it in specific ways relevant to the needs of the church in the writer's own times.⁵²⁹

The gap between "Jesus in history" and "Jesus in the Gospels" does problematise the search for the historical Jesus. However, the fact that various NT writers interpreted and appropriated Jesus' teaching on the love of neighbour in their specific ways plays in our favour—for this chapter seeks to examine precisely the manner in which different writers received, transmitted, and applied Lev 19:18, that is, the record of their diverse reception. As such, whether the Double Love Command or the command to love one's enemies goes back to the very mouth of Jesus or only to an early tradition that is one degree removed from the historical Jesus is inconsequential for this chapter. Regardless of what the exact wording of the historical Jesus might have been, the fact remains that the Gospel writers all received and interwove this command in their own ways. It is precisely these *different modes of reception* exhibited in the Gospels, rather than their precise sequence of reception, that will be of critical import for this chapter. The historical questions are certainly important, as the vast literary output on these issues testify. Moreover, the sequence of reception and the modes of reception go so closely hand in hand that driving a deep wedge between these two would be both artificial and unfruitful. Nonetheless, source-critical

529. Furnish, *The Love Command*, 22.

questions, particularly the recent quest for the historical Jesus that have been occupying the centre stage in Gospel studies, are of secondary concern here. The aim is only to map out the shared and diverging conceptions vis-à-vis Lev 19:18 among select NT writers. As such, although a good case has been made against the consensus view, namely, the so-called “Two Document” hypothesis, the majority of scholars still hold to some form of it.⁵³⁰ Since establishing the redactional-critical order of the Synoptics is not our concern, the current consensus and the general order applied to the Gospel writers will be adopted here: the longest Markan account (if the parable of the Good Samaritan is excluded from the Lukan account, that is) forms the basis out of which the other two Synoptic accounts were composed.⁵³¹ I will forego the detailed discussion of source, since our interest lies not in identifying the

530. On the sources of the Synoptic Gospels, see: Rudolf K. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. John Marsh (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1963); Furnish, *The Love Command*, 30-45; E. P. Sanders, “Overlaps of Mark and Q and the Synoptic Problem,” *NTS* 19 (1973): 453–65; John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*, SAC (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987); idem, *Q, the Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus* (Louisville: WJK, 2008); C. M. Tuckett, “Synoptic Problem,” *ABD* VI:263-70; idem, *From the Sayings to the Gospels*, WUNT 328 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014); Boris Repschinski, *The Controversy Stories in the Gospel of Matthew: Their Redaction, Form Und [sic] Relevance for the Relationship Between the Matthean Community and Formative Judaism*, FRLANT 189 (Göttingen: V&R, 2000); Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel of Matthew*, trans. Robert R. Barr (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 221; Paul Foster, “Is It Possible to Dispense with Q?” *NT* 45 (2003): 313–37; Collins, *Mark*, 570-71; Paul Foster, Andrew F. Gregory, John S. Kloppenborg, and Jozef Verheyden, eds., *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008: Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett*, BETL 239 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011). For recent opponents of the Q-hypothesis, see: Mark S. Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and Synoptic Problem*, Biblical Studies (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002); Francis Watson, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013).

531. Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21-28: A Commentary*, ed. Helmut Koester, trans. J. E. Crouch, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 75-77. Also see: W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr, *Commentary on Matthew XIX-XXVIII*, vol. 3 of *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 235-36; Christoph Burchard, *Studien zu Theologie, Sprache und Umwelt des Neuen Testaments*, WUNT 107 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 4-5.

sayings of the historical Jesus or surmising whether the writers were influenced by Palestinian or Hellenistic Judaism. I will study the Markan account first, and then examine the Matthean and Lukan accounts in relation to the Markan account. Source-critical insights will be taken into account only insofar as they illuminate the writers' various reception.

5.4.1 The Markan love of neighbour

The quotation of the levitical love command is found twice in a single pericope in Mark. Unlike the other Gospels in which the command to love *someone* (i.e., neighbour, enemies, one another) recurs, the command to love is found only in ch.12 in Mark.⁵³² This paucity makes it difficult to work out what Mark precisely meant when he employed the citation of Lev 19:18. As a result, the meaning of the Markan love command is often sought in relation to the Matthean and the Lukan versions, in spite of the fact that most interpreters hold to the chronological priority of the Markan version. While intertextual resonances and harmonisation can be useful for canonical interpretation, the concern here is different. It is best to study the Markan love command on its own by analysing what Mark said without "filling the gap" with other attestations of Lev 19:18 in the Synoptics. Again, this contextual analysis is admittedly difficult in Mark's case. Where Mark seems to make no overt attempt to re-interpret the love command, it will be assumed that he made use of the traditional material with the original meaning of Lev 19:18 in mind.

532. The word ἀγαπάω occurs only once more in Mark where Jesus is said to have loved (ἡγάπησεν) the rich young man (10:21).

5.4.1.1 Love as the commandment *par excellence* (Mark 12:28-34)

²⁸ Καὶ προσελθὼν εἰς τῶν γραμματέων ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητούντων, ἰδὼν ὅτι καλῶς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν· ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων; ²⁹ ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πρώτη ἐστὶν· ἄκουε, Ἰσραήλ, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστίν, ³⁰ καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου. ³¹ δευτέρα αὕτη· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολὴ οὐκ ἐστίν. ³² καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ γραμματεὺς· καλῶς, διδάσκαλε, ἐπ' ἀληθείας εἶπες ὅτι εἷς ἐστίν καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἄλλος πλην αὐτοῦ. ³³ καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτόν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτόν περισσότερόν ἐστιν πάντων τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ θυσιῶν. ³⁴ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἰδὼν [αὐτόν] ὅτι νουνεχῶς ἀπεκρίθη εἶπεν αὐτῷ· οὐ μακρὰν εἶ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι ἐτόλμα αὐτόν ἐπερωτῆσαι.

One of the scribes came near and heard them disputing with one another, and seeing that he answered them well, he asked him, "Which commandment is the first of all?" Jesus answered, "The first is, 'Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God, the Lord is one; you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength.' The second is this, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' There is no other commandment greater than these." Then the scribe said to him, "You are right, Teacher; you have truly said that 'he is one, and besides him there is no other'; and 'to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the strength,' and 'to love one's neighbor as oneself,'—this is much more important than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices." When Jesus saw that he answered wisely, he said to him, "You are not far from the kingdom of God." After that no one dared to ask him any question.

Mark 12:28-34 is set within Jesus' last week of his ministry in Jerusalem and marks the end of a series of polemical exchanges between the Jerusalem authorities and Jesus. This Markan pericope is preceded by the Sadducees' question about the levirate marriage and resurrection (12:18-27) and followed by the question about David's son (12:35-37). These pericopae are located within the larger framework of 11:17-12:40. Meier notes, "Mark 11:27–12:40 contains three stories of dispute or conflict, a polemical parable, one friendly academic conversation, a christological question posed and left hanging by

Jesus, and a final vitriolic attack by Jesus on the scribes.”⁵³³ In spite of the fact that 12:28-34 is set within the framework of *Streitgespräche*, the tone of the exchange between Jesus and the scribe in this particular pericope is rather amicable (hence often referred to as *Schulgespräch*), as the response of the scribe (v.32) and the final comment of Jesus (v.34) show.⁵³⁴ The macro structure is relatively straightforward:

- v.28a Opening: one of the scribes draws near
- v.28b The question of the scribe
- vv.29-31 Jesus’ answer
 - a) First command: the *Shema*
 - b) Second command: the levitical love command
 - c) Evaluative statement: μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολὴ οὐκ ἔστιν
- v.32a The scribe’s affirmation
- v.33 The scribe’s response
 - a) The scribe’s recapitulation of the first command
 - b) The scribe’s recapitulation of the second command
 - c) Evaluative statement: περισσότερόν ἐστιν πάντων...
- v.34a The last words: Jesus’ affirmation of the scribe
- v.34b Closing: response of the crowd

V.28 sets the scene for a curious exchange between Jesus and his interlocutor.

Having heard how well Jesus answered the Sadducees, εἷς τῶν γραμματέων
(‘one of the scribes’) approaches him to pose a question: ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη

533. Meier, *Marginal Jew*, IV:482.

534. Joseph Vlcek Kozar, “Complementary Insight: A Scribe’s Approval of the ‘Most Important’ Commandment in Mark 12:28-34,” *Proceedings - Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* 22 (2002): 35–45. Burchard thinks this pericope was reworked from “eine ältere Sammlung von Streitgesprächen, die ursprünglich selbständig überliefert wurden.” Burchard, “Das doppelte Liebesgebot,” 7; cf. Bultmann, *The History*, 22-23, 51. Robert C. Tannehill thinks this pericope is a “quest” story, and Jesus’ final commendation moves the story “beyond commendation to quest.” Robert C. Tannehill, “Varieties of Synoptic Pronouncement Stories,” *Semeia* 20 (1981): 112-13. Marcus posits that the “more irenic Markan features” derive from the “pre-Markan tale.” Joel Marcus, *Mark 8-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB 27A (New Haven: YUP, 2009), 841.

πάντων; (“Which commandment is the first of all?”).⁵³⁵ Marcus argues that the string of participles (προσελθὼν ... ἀκούσας ... ἰδὼν) that precedes the finite verb ἐπηρώτησεν emphasises the “attractive power of Jesus, which is potent enough to overpower the resistance that characterizes other scribes in the Markan narrative.”⁵³⁶ While the sense of πρώτη as “first in importance” (cf. 6:21; 9:35; 10:31, 44; see: BDAG) is fairly straightforward, how these commands relate to other (lesser) commands has attracted some attention. Most scholars reject extreme reductionism or naive supersessionism, observing that Mark most likely elevates the Double Love Command without diminishing the importance of other commands. The oft-cited rabbinic parallels demonstrate the existence of a Jewish tradition in which one can speak of relative significance without belittling the value of the lesser ones. It is well-known that the 613 commandments, 248 positive commands and 365 prohibitions, were divided into “heavy” and “light” commandments in rabbinic tradition.⁵³⁷ Whether the provenance of this pericope was Hellenistic or Palestinian, Mark portrays Jesus and his interlocutor as being at ease with this type of dialogue.⁵³⁸

535. Meier argues that εἷς here should not be read as an indefinite article “a” but “Mark stresses that out of the *massa damnata* of the scribes, there comes forth one—and only one—scribe who recognizes Jesus as an impressive teacher, asks a sincere question, and receives Jesus’ answer with enthusiastic approbation.” Meier, *Marginal Jew*, IV:489. Marcus makes a similar point. Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 841.

536. Ibid., 842.

537. Luz, *Matthew 21-28*, 81-82.

538. Bornkamm (followed by Burchard and Berger) locates the origin of this pericope in “hellenistisch-jüdisch Theologie,” adducing several Philonic parallels. Bornkamm, “Das Doppelgebot,” 88-89; Burchard, “Das doppelte Liebesgebot,” 25-26; Berger, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu*. Allison does not think the pericope was Hellenistic in origin and maintains that the practice of summarising and categorising was common in ancient Judaism, as most clearly attested in Philo (*Dec.* 19-20; 50; 106; 108-110; 154; *Spec. Leg.* 1:1). Allison contends that Mark employs the Double Love Command as a summary of the Decalogue. *Dec.* 108-110 characterises those who observe the first five words of the Decalogue as “lovers of God” (φιλοθεοί) and those who observe the second half as “lovers of

In vv.29-30, Jesus responds by quoting the *Shema* (Deut 6:4b-5), which more-or-less follows the LXX.⁵³⁹ Mark adds an extra adverbial phrase ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου ('with all your mind') and substitutes δυνάμεώς ('might') with ἰσχύος ('strength'), which may be an alternative translation of **כֶּחֶץ**.⁵⁴⁰ The second commandment in v.31 is an exact quotation of LXX-Lev 19:18b. Jesus ends his first speech with a bold assessment: μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ("there is no other commandment greater than these"). While the scribe only asks for *a* command, Jesus replies with two commands as he emphasises their unity with the plural τούτων ('these') in v.31. Then the scribe, being impressed, affirms Jesus' answer in turn. Meier notes, "The scribe now becomes like an excited student who wants to show his teacher not only that he has understood the lesson but also that he can give it back in his own

humans" (φιλανθρώποι): "This interpretation, which is offered as though well-known and obvious, makes plain that the summary of the Torah, the Decalogue, may itself be summarized by two demands, the demand to love God and the demand to love one's neighbour. The parallel to Mark 12:38-41 is all the closer in that, in Philo, the set of commandments concerning love of God is the 'first set' and the set concerning love of humanity the 'second set'...." Dale C. Allison Jr., "Mark 12:28-31 and the Decalogue," in *Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, JSNTSup 104; SSEJC 3 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 272. Others who agree with Allison: E. P. Sanders, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies* (London: SCM Press, 1990), 68-71; Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, WBC 34B (Waco, TX: Word, 2001), 264; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 839. Luz also agrees but points out that while the concept of φιλανθρωπία is indeed "a programmatic term that summarizes the second tablet of the Decalogue," it is "hardly ever related to Lev 19:18 or to the term 'the neighbour'." Luz, *Matthew 21-28*, 83, 84. Ruzer goes as far to posit that the Double Love Command tradition already existed in the Second Temple period and only later attributed to Jesus. Ruzer, *Mapping*, 73-74, esp. n.9. By contrast, Meier sees a much greater discontinuity between the Double Love Command, which he attributes to the historical Jesus, and other sources—be it the HB, DDS, Jewish pseudepigrapha, early Rabbinic literature and even the rest of the NT. Tsuji asserts against the scholarly consensus that the notion that there is a hierarchical order (i.e., the first and the second commandments) in the Law does not seem Jewish. Rather it reflects a later Christian thinking, which emphasised the love of neighbour. Tsuji, *The Beginning*, 40.

539. Evans notes the variations in the Greek tradition itself. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 264.

540. Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 837.

words and with his own insights added.”⁵⁴¹ Marcus observes that the scribe’s affirmation εἷς ἐστὶν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ—which is “an important Jewish principle that was frequently used *against* Christians, who were accused of making Jesus equal to God and thus violating the oneness of God proclaimed in the Shema” (italics Marcus’s)—in the context of scribe’s approval of Jesus reveals that “the Markan narrative implies that the Shema’s affirmation of divine oneness is compatible with reverence of Jesus.”⁵⁴² If this is so, then Marcus is right to observe that “our passage is almost as much about the relationship between Jesus and the scribe as it is about the great commandment in the Law.”⁵⁴³ At any rate, the scribe abridges and repeats both the first and the second commandments, as he omits the two qualifiers (soul, mind) from Jesus’ formulation and instead adds συνέσεως (‘understanding’).⁵⁴⁴ Moreover, in place of Jesus’ closing statement (v.31) he adds περισσότερόν ἐστιν πάντων τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ θυσιῶν (‘is much more than all the burnt offerings and sacrifices’).⁵⁴⁵ Although most interpreters see this as a scriptural allusion to the great statements in the prophetic tradition (e.g., Hos 6:6; 1 Sam 15:22 LXX), the precise implication of this sentence continues to be debated.⁵⁴⁶ On the one hand, Bornkamm, followed by Culpepper, Moloney, and Grundmann, notes that the scribe’s reformulation introduces a new

541. Meier, *Marginal Jew*, IV:495.

542. Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 844. Meier also points out that Mark portrays the scribe as lower than Jesus by the use of abbreviated response. Meier, *Marginal Jew*, IV:486.

543. Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 841.

544. Culpepper observes, “‘Understanding’ may also be a combination of ‘soul’ and ‘mind’.” R. Alan Culpepper, *Mark*, SHBC 20 (Macon, CA: Smyth & Helwys, 2007), 420.

545. ‘ὀλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ θυσιῶν’ is a well-known collocation in the LXX, which occurs over hundred times (e.g., Exod 10:25; 18:12; Lev 7:37; 23:37; Judg 13:23; 1 Sam 15:22; Hos 6:6; Jer 7:22; 14:12; 17:26) and “reflects various great statements in the prophetic traditions.” Evans also indicates a couple of potential parallels in 1QS 9:4 and 4Q266 10 i 13. Evans, *Mark*, 265-66.

546. Collins, *Mark*, 576; Evans, *Mark*, 266; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 840.

element that extends Jesus' original reformulation, which is an allusion to the criticism of the cultic sacrifices.

Es ist darum nur folgerichtig, wenn der Schriftgelehrte die wieder im hellenistischen Judentum verbreitete Kritik der Kultopfer mit dem monotheistischen Bekenntnis und dem doppelten Liebesgebot verbindet. Auch sie ist bekanntlich der Botschaft der Propheten und der Frömmigkeit der Psalmen nicht fremd und ein starkes Motiv auch in Jesu Verkündigung.⁵⁴⁷

On the other hand, others see no implicit criticism of the sacrificial cult. For instance, while affirming that this passage does point to the prime importance of "mercy or kindness, knowledge of God, and hearing and obeying the voice of the Lord," Collins maintains, "That does not mean that cultic sacrifices do not need to be made, or still less than they ought to be abolished."⁵⁴⁸ There is no space to determine the wider implication of this statement within the Markan thought here, but Collins's emphasis seems to be on the mark. The rhetorical force of the statement that the Double Love Command is much more than all the offerings would be diminished, unless both interlocutors took for granted the significance of cultic sacrifice.

In response to the scribe's recapitulation with a twist, Jesus shows approval and declares that the scribe answered *νουνεχῶς* ('wisely') and *οὐ*

547. Bornkamm, "Das Doppelgebot," 89-90; Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, THKNT 2 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1973), 252; Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2012), 240-41. Kozar also argues that the scribe's response sets the scene for "Jesus' prediction of Temple destruction (Mark 13:1-2), which immediately follows these controversy stories." Kozar, "Complementary Insight," 38. Culpepper notes that the scribe's response "reverberates with Jesus' cursing of the fig tree and condemnation of the temple (11:12-21) and the parable of the wicked tenants (12:1-12). Having condemned the temple, Jesus now displaces the sacrifices as unnecessary." Culpepper, *Mark*, 422.

548. Collins, *Mark*, 576.

μακρὰν εἶ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ (“you are not far from the kingdom of God”).⁵⁴⁹

Here the motif of “seeing” (ἰδών), which appears at the outset of this passage, re-emerges: the scribe first saw how well (καλῶς) Jesus answered the Sadducees, and now Jesus sees how wisely the scribe responded. Marcus observes, “The God whom Jesus proclaims, therefore, is one who grasps the mind as well as heart and thus brings a new type of perception into the world.”⁵⁵⁰ Evans states that the scribe is “close to entering the ranks of those who have responded to the message of the kingdom ... [which] has been the essence of Jesus’ proclamation from the very beginning (cf. 1:14–15; 4:11, 26, 30; 9:1, 47; 10:14, 15, 23–25; 14:25).”⁵⁵¹ While the scribe is not *in* but rather only *close to* the kingdom of God, he nonetheless plays an instrumental role in drawing out a particularly Markan emphasis: “What is important for true religion is belief in and worship of the one God and obedience to the moral law, not religious ceremony or cultic performance.”⁵⁵² The dialogue ends with Jesus having the last word. The crowd is silenced in the face of his scholastic caliber, which also marks the end of the Markan thread of *Streitgespräche*.

549. *Νουνεχῶς* is not found anywhere else in the NT or LXX but attested in Aristotle, Polybius, Sib. Or. 1:7; cf. BDAG, 549.

550. Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 844.

551. Evans, *Mark*, 266.

552. Furnish, *The Love Command*, 29. Furnish thinks that “the Marcan version of the Great Commandment has been formulated for apologetic purposes. Its usefulness in early Christian missionary preaching is evident: There is One God. You must love him and your neighbor. Obedience to his will is more important than the performance of cultic ritual.... What is emphasized, doubtless for apologetic-missionary purposes, is the necessary connection between belief in one God and obedience to the moral (as contrasted with the cultic) law.” Ibid., 30. Evans also observes, “The scribe’s remarkable pronouncement serves the Markan context well, underscoring the rightness of Jesus’ message, even in the face of priestly criticism and opposition.” Evans, *Mark*, 267.

To sum up, a few points may be highlighted. First, Mark records for the first time Jesus' bold declaration that the Double Love Command is above all other commandments. As previously discussed, while there are notional precursors, a succinct and definitive declaration as such is found nowhere in Jewish literature prior to Mark. Second, one distinguishing feature of the Markan love command is the lack of the "summary" function of the love command. While the primacy of the *Shema* and the love of neighbour is boldly stressed and while the Double Love Command is affirmed as greater than any command, nowhere does Mark indicate that the Double Love Command both summarises (contra Paul) or re-interprets (contra Matthew, see below) all the other commands.⁵⁵³ Third, contrary to the common perception, the Markan version of the love command seems to exhibit a rather restrictive sense vis-à-vis the object of neighbourly love. The oft-assumed "universal" outlook of love is not present, or at least not salient, in Mark. He seems to have made no attempt to reconfigure the parameter of the object of love or to redefine who the neighbour is for Christians. Even though the precise historical referent of the neighbour as Mark imagined it may not be ascertainable, it seems reasonable to conclude that Mark only makes a minimal attempt to widen the restrictive scope of the neighbour of Lev 19:18. Neither the citation of Lev 19:34 nor the command to love one's enemies (contra Matthew and Luke) is found in Mark. While the levitical love command is explicitly combined with the love of God and becomes the most important commandment, Lev 19:18 is neither the summary of the whole Law nor a love that knows no bounds in Mark.

553. Meier, *Marginal Jew*, IV:490.

5.4.2 The Matthean love of neighbour

Matthew quotes the levitical love command three times (5:43; 19:19; 22:39). This section will first briefly examine 5:43-48 (the love of enemies) and 19:16-22 (the rich young man) in order to frame the discussion of 22:34-40 (the greatest command). After making some preliminary observations, the study of 22:34-40 with 5:43 and 19:19 in mind will be conducted. Then I will conclude this section by summarising a few specifically Matthean features in connexion with Lev 19:18.

5.4.2.1 Matt 5:43-48

The first citation of Lev 19:18 appears at the end of the six antitheses (5:21-48) that culminate with the command to love one's enemies in vv.43-48.

⁴³ Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου καὶ μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου. ⁴⁴ ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν· ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς, ⁴⁵ ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους. ⁴⁶ ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; ⁴⁷ καὶ ἐὰν ἀσπάσῃσθε τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν μόνον, τί περισσὸν ποιεῖτε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ ἐθνικοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; ⁴⁸ ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν.

You have heard that it was said, "You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy." But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be children of your Father in heaven; for he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the righteous and on the unrighteous. For if you love those who love you, what reward do you have? Do not even the tax collectors do the same? And if you greet only your brothers and sisters, what more are you doing than others? Do not even the Gentiles do the same? Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

The adverbial phrase ὡς σεαυτὸν is omitted from the levitical love command in 5:43, and the command to love one's neighbour is coupled with another command: καὶ μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου ("and you shall hate your enemy").⁵⁵⁴ The omission of ὡς σεαυτὸν is probably intentional, since its absence makes the first imperative formally parallel to the second.⁵⁵⁵ Moreover, such an omission is not uncharacteristic of Matthew, as he often "prefers to keep the statement of the legal precept under discussion to a minimum."⁵⁵⁶ The command to hate one's enemy is not found anywhere in the HB, but a similar statement appears in 1QS 1:10-11. This points to the strong possibility of a pre-existing Jewish tradition.⁵⁵⁷ Konradt, who thinks the antitheses are directed not "against the Torah itself," contends that this quotation is introduced here to illustrate the Pharisees' false interpretation of the Torah.⁵⁵⁸ Whether v.43 is aimed polemically at an early tradition preserved in 1QS or against the Pharisaic interpretation, Jesus clearly rejects the equation of

554. Luz observes that the command to love the enemies is probably "the basic title for the three following parts," which is then "exemplified with individual examples. Thus 'love' is something comprehensive." Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*, ed. Helmut Koester, trans. J. E. Crouch, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 286. This structure corresponds closely to CD 6:20-7:4 (see Ch.4). Davies and Allison lists the following "similar sentiments" that appear in the HB: Deut 7:2; 20:16; 23:4, 7; 30:7; Ps 26:5; 137:7-9; 139:19-22 (cf. *Sipra* on Lev 19:18); Polybius 18:37.7; Hesiod, *Op.* 342-3; Solon fg. 1:3-5; Plato, *Tim.* 17d-18a; *Rep.* 375c; *Meno* 71e; Tacitus, *Histo.* 5:5-6. W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr, *Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII*, vol. 1 of *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 549.

555. Theißen thinks the omission of "as yourself" here reveals Matthew's tendency towards universalism. Gerd Theißen, "Nächstenliebe und Egalität: Jak 2,1-13 als Höhepunkt urchristlicher Ethik," in *Der Jakobusbrief: Beiträge zur Rehabilitierung der "strohernen Epistel"*, ed. Petra von Gemünden, Matthias Konradt, and Gerd Theissen, *Beiträge zum Verstehen der Bibel* 3 (Münster: Lit, 2003), 122.

556. Paul Foster, *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew's Gospel*, WUNT 2/177 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 132. Also, John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 264.

557. As noted in Chapter Four, S clearly establishes a conceptual link between "loving the neighbour" and "hating the non-neighbour/enemy."

558. Konradt, "Love Command," 273.

“loving one’s neighbour = hating one’s enemy” and transforms it to “loving one’s neighbour = loving one’s enemies.”⁵⁵⁹ This pithy command ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν (“love your enemies”) fundamentally challenges any attempt to restrict the scope of neighbourly love. But who are the enemies? The immediate context characterises the enemies as τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς (*those who persecute you*), and the ensuing rhetorical questions of vv.46-47 imply that the enemies are those who do not love the addressees and who were not regarded by the addressees as brothers or sisters. Konradt argues, “[T]he interpretation in Matt 5 is of a more principal nature. Love of one’s enemy is not confined to persons within the community who have acted improperly towards oneself, but it also refers to outsiders.”⁵⁶⁰ However, Luz qualifies that the love of enemies here has little to do with “extreme cases of a general love of humanity” in contrast to the Hellenistic Jewish statements about philanthropy.⁵⁶¹ Even though these “outsiders” could refer to individual or national enemies, Luz insists:

At issue are enemies in their total maliciousness. Absent is the hidden ulterior motive that the enemy might be made a friend. Limiting the enemy to one’s personal enemy misses the point.... Jesus takes away absolutely nothing from the enemies’ cruelty and maliciousness and ... he demands not that one *also* love them but that one love *precisely* them. (italics Luz’s)⁵⁶²

559. Also noteworthy is the deliberate pluralising of ἐχθρόν to ἐχθρούς.

560. Konradt, “Love Command,” 274.

561. Luz, *Matthew* 1-7, 286.

562. Ibid. Likewise, Nolland thinks, “The best option is to take ‘enemy’ in a quite general sense at the individual and personal level, and to think in terms of how one should orient oneself to someone who is hostile.” Nolland, *Matthew*, 264. However, though Nolland is right to emphasise the personal and individual level of enmity, there is no reason why Matthew could not have also posited this adversary at the communal, or even national, level. Also, see: Luise Schottroff, *Essays on the Love Commandment* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), 9–39.

Vv.46-47 makes plain that true love of neighbour fundamentally opposes the Graeco-Roman concept of reciprocity among social equals.⁵⁶³ The Matthean Jesus concretised the love of enemies, and by extension the love of neighbour, through linking the act of love to the act of prayer.

X You have heard...

a) Love your neighbour = b) Hate your enemy

X' But I say...

b') Love your enemies = a') Pray for those who persecute you

Finally, v.48 reveals a specifically Matthean emphasis on the love of neighbour as a necessary means to perfection. Luz notes, "With 'perfect' he emphasizes the fundamental significance of the love of enemies. It is not one demand among others but the center and apex of all commandments that lead to perfection" (τέλειοι; cf. 19:21, see below).⁵⁶⁴

5.4.2.2 Matt 19:16-22

The second occurrence of Lev 19:18 is found in Matt 19:19. Even though this pericope is also found in Mark 10:17-22 and Luke 18:18-30, only Matthew includes the citation of the levitical love command.

Καὶ ἰδοὺ εἷς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ εἶπεν· διδάσκαλε, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα σχῶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός· εἰ δὲ θέλεις εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν, τήρησον τὰς ἐντολάς. λέγει αὐτῷ·

563. Konradt adduces Plato, Menon 71e. Konradt, "Love Command," 273. Also see Alan Kirk, "'Love Your Enemies,' the Golden Rule, and Ancient Reciprocity (Luke 6:27-35)," *JBL* 122 (2003): 667–86 for a short survey of various views and attempts to understand the love of enemy vis-à-vis the surrounding Graeco-Roman ideals. On the paraenetic tradition vis-à-vis the enemy love, see: John Piper, *"Love Your Enemies": Jesus' Love Command in the Synoptic Gospels and in the Early Christian Paraenesis* (Cambridge: CUP, 1979).

564. Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 290.

ποιίας; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· τὸ οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ νεανίσκος· πάντα ταῦτα ἐφύλαξα· τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ; ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι, ὑπάγε πώλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ δός [τοῖς] πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανοῖς, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι. ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ νεανίσκος τὸν λόγον ἀπῆλθεν λυπούμενος· ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά.

Then someone came to him and said, "Teacher, what good deed must I do to have eternal life?" And he said to him, "Why do you ask me about what is good? There is only one who is good. If you wish to enter into life, keep the commandments." He said to him, "Which ones?" And Jesus said, "You shall not murder; You shall not commit adultery; You shall not steal; You shall not bear false witness; Honor your father and mother; also, You shall love your neighbor as yourself." The young man said to him, "I have kept all these; what do I still lack?" Jesus said to him, "If you wish to be perfect, go, sell your possessions, and give the money to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; then come, follow me." When the young man heard this word, he went away grieving, for he had many possessions.

After Jesus moves from Galilee to Judea (19:1), a certain man (εἷς) comes up to him to ask a question: τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα σχῶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον; (*'what good must I do to have eternal life?'*) In response to the rich man's question, the Matthean Jesus explicitly commands the man to keep (τήρησον) the commandments, unlike in the Markan and the Lukan versions in which Jesus simply says τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας (*'you know the commandments'*; Mark 10:19; Luke 18:20). Upon hearing Jesus' answer, the rich man seeks clarification. Jesus this time responds by quoting more-or-less the latter half of the Decalogue and then adds καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν at this point (v.19). The response of the rich man in v.20 is intriguing. He maintains that he has kept all the commandments, and in the Matthean version, this would include even the levitical love command. He asks yet another question: τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ; (*'what do I still lack?'*) Jesus responds and says that if the young man wishes to be

perfect, he ought to sell his possessions and give the money to the poor. This reveals another critical dimension of neighbourly love in Matthew: helping the poor through extreme economic generosity.

But, is the call to give up his possession for the poor an *additional* commandment or requirement to the love command? Or, is this an interpretation or concrete application of Lev 19:18 in this particular instance of the man's life? In the case of the former, Jesus would be accepting the young man's claim to total obedience to the commandments. In the case of the latter, Jesus would be implicitly calling his claim into question. The second option is strongly implied by Jesus' statement in v.23: it is hard for a rich person to enter the kingdom of heaven. This refers back to the opening question of this pericope (v.16), and the fact that the man is denied from entering into the kingdom (vv.23-24) "implies logically that he has not fulfilled the commandments, at least not in his encounter with Jesus."⁵⁶⁵ The remarkable response of the young man in v.20 ("*all these I have kept*") suggests that he had a concrete idea of what loving one's neighbour meant. However, his interpretation of what the love of neighbour entailed differed from that of Jesus. Konradt emphasises:

And this means that, contrary to Mark's version, Jesus's demand that he should sell his possessions for the benefit of the poor has to be understood as Jesus's unfolding of the meaning of the love command for the young man in his specific life situation. Furthermore, following Jesus and fulfilling the commandments are not to be viewed as separate items, but fulfilling the commandments according to Jesus's interpretation is an integral part of following him.⁵⁶⁶

565. Konradt, "Love Command," 275. Davies and Allison concur. Davies and Allison, *Matthew 19-28*, 46.

566. Konradt, "Love Command," 275-76.

What then does the addition of the levitical love command in Matt 19:16-22 accomplish? It seems to signal two things.

First, Matthew establishes a direct link between Lev 19:18 and extreme economic generosity, which is at least for the young man an indispensable (though not the sole) outworking of the love of neighbour. While the notional connexion between the love of neighbour, economic justice/generosity and holiness is already found in Lev 19 (v.2, vv.12-18; see ch.2), this pericope intensifies this association. Luz observes, as do Davies and Allison, that τέλειος in Matthew refers not to some human ideal or sinlessness but to “completeness” (תמים).⁵⁶⁷ Davies and Allison argue that whereas in the Sermon on the Mount, τέλειος is “the completeness of love, here it is the completeness of obedience. The rich man would be perfect if he exhibited whole-hearted obedience to Jesus Christ.”⁵⁶⁸ For this young man “the treasure in heaven and the treasure on earth are mutually exclusive (cf. 6:19-21). ‘The money question raises the issue of one's own humanity’.”⁵⁶⁹

Second, whereas in Mark 10:21 and Luke 18:22 Jesus prefaces the call to sell his possession by pointing out that the rich man still lacks one thing, the Matthean Jesus says εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι (‘if you want to be perfect’). Jesus could have easily said, “If you wish to love your neighbour,” but Matthew chooses the idea of perfection precisely at this juncture. The adjective τέλειος occurs only twice in Matthew (5:48; 19:21), and in both instances, the motif of perfection is closely linked to the love of neighbour. As in Matt 5:43-48 then, the love of neighbour is closely bound with the concept of perfection in

567. Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary*, ed. Helmut Koester, trans J. E. Crouch, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 513; Davies and Allison, *Matthew 19-28*, 48.

568. Ibid.

569. Luz, *Matthew 8-20*, 514.

Matthew. But then this raises two interrelated questions: what is the nature of this “perfection,” and does Matthew envisage two kinds or ranks of Jesus-believers? Luz observes three important aspects of the Matthean conception of perfection, which provide answers to both of these questions at once. For one, perfection has “a qualitative element” for those who “understand God’s commandment in the sense of love of enemy and of neighbor as unbounded, indivisible demand and who act accordingly (cf. 5:43-48).”⁵⁷⁰ In addition, perfection has “a quantitative element” wherein “[t]o become perfect is to go beyond what is normal and customary. It is to embark on a way that reflects something of God’s otherness and of Jesus’ own radical life.”⁵⁷¹ Finally and most importantly, “perfection is a matter of complete attachment to Jesus,” that is, it is a simple response to Jesus’ call to follow him.⁵⁷² Luz concludes:

For Matthew “perfection” is not the highest stage of the Christian life, a position to which only a few “better” Christians are called. Discipleship for Matthew is not something that is reserved for only a few special Christians; it is rather the key to being a Christian at all.⁵⁷³

As such, neither perfection nor the love of neighbour is a special requirement for “higher” Jesus-believers, but they are both implicit in the call to discipleship in Matthew. Pursuing perfection through the love of neighbour then is not an optional requirement but the very essence of Jesus’ calling.

570. Luz, *Matthew 8-20*, 513.

571. Ibid.

572. It is no coincidence that the call to follow Jesus prefaces (Matt 4:18-22) the Sermon on the Mount. Ibid.

573. Ibid., 513-14. Davies and Allison, who follow and enumerate Calvin’s six points of argument on this issue, concur. Davies and Allison, *Matthew 19-28*, 47-48; cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 404-6. They also challenge the negative view of wealth in Matthew and the suggestion that Matthew wants all of his readers to give up material goods.

To recapitulate the preliminary observations thus far, the Matthean reception of the levitical love command is characterised by the following: [i] the object of love in Matthew is not a neighbour as narrowly construed in Leviticus and probably still maintained in Mark, but Matthew radically widens the scope to encompass one's personal and communal/national enemies; [ii] Matthew highlights extreme economic generosity towards the poor and the needy as the necessary outworking of the love of neighbour at least for the rich man; and [iii] the love of neighbour is tied intimately to the idea of perfection, both of which are implicit in Jesus' call to discipleship. With these in mind, we turn to the famous Double Love Command pericope.

5.4.2.3 Love as the hermeneutical crux (Matt 22:34–40)

Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ἐφίμωσεν τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν εἰς ἑξ αὐτῶν [νομικὸς] πειράζων αὐτόν· διδάσκαλε, ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ; ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ· ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου· αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη ἐντολή. δευτέρα δὲ ὁμοία αὐτῇ· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. ἐν ταύταις ταῖς δυσὶν ἐντολαῖς ὅλος ὁ νόμος κρέμαται καὶ οἱ προφῆται.

When the Pharisees heard that he had silenced the Sadducees, they gathered together, and one of them, a lawyer, asked him a question to test him. "Teacher, which commandment in the law is the greatest?" He said to him, "'You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind.' This is the greatest and first commandment. And a second is like it: 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

The final and the boldest expression of Lev 19:18 comes into view in Matt 22:34-40. Matthew here combines indissolubly the love of neighbour with the love of God and forms the greatest command in the Law.⁵⁷⁴ The Matthean

574. On the history of interpretation of this pericope, see: Luz, *Matthew* 21-28, 77-81.

version is much shorter than the Markan version, but as in Mark, Matthew situates this pericope within the framework of controversy stories towards the very end of Jesus' encounters in Jerusalem.⁵⁷⁵ The structure of Matt 22:34-40 may be divided as follows:

vv.34-35	Opening: The gathering of the Pharisees
v.36	The Pharisee's question
vv.37-40	Jesus' response
v.37	First command: the second half of the <i>Shema</i> (Deut 6:5)
v.38	Evaluative: αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη ἐντολή
v.39a	Evaluative: δευτέρα δὲ ὁμοία αὐτῇ
v.39b	Second command: Lev 19:18b
v.40	Closing: ὁ νόμος κρέμαται καὶ οἱ προφῆται.

Whereas in Mark εἷς τῶν γραμματέων ('one of the scribes'; 12:28) draws near to ask a question, Matthew specifies him as one of the Pharisees who gathered together (συνήχθησαν) to test (πειράζων) Jesus. Through weaving the leitmotif of testing (cf. 16:1; 19:3; 22:18) into this passage, which is clearly "intended to examine his [i.e., Jesus'] knowledge of and fidelity to the Torah," Matthew divests the pericope of the amicable tone found in Mark and heightens the sense of hostility between Jesus and his interlocutor.⁵⁷⁶ Matthew names the opponent as a Pharisee who stands up to test Jesus and omits the wise response of the Markan scribe along with Jesus' ensuing approval (Mark 12:33-34). Matthew's account exhibits a polemical edge, and as Overman

575. Davies and Allison observe that the Matthean version is "much shorter (82 words; Mark: 153)" and "more Semitic (preposition of verb, v. 35 diff. Mark 12:28; εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν, v. 35; no copula in v. 36 diff. Mark 12:28; positive for superlative, v. 36; cf. the use of ἐν = *bē* in v. 37 diff. Mark 12:30)." Davies and Allison, *Matthew 19-28*, 236-37.

576. Schnackenburg, *Matthew*, 223. Also, see: Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, THKNT 1 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1972), 476.

states, “Matthew has made this pericope into a conflict story.”⁵⁷⁷ Gundry also summarises:

In Mark, one of the scribes comes, hears the discussion with the Sadducees, and asks a question about the first commandment. In Matthew, the Pharisees have already heard of Jesus’ silencing the Sadducees and gather together first. Only then does one of them ask a question. Thus Matthew revises the tradition in order to gain an allusion to Ps 2:2. In that psalm it is the heathen who gather against the Lord’s anointed. But Matthew has made the crowds represent converts from heathenism (v 33); so now he applies the psalm to a segment of the Jewish leadership, the Pharisees.⁵⁷⁸

The question posed by the Matthean Pharisee differs slightly from the one posed by the Markan scribe. The Matthean version begins with a vocative, διδάσκαλε (‘teacher’; as in Lukan; see below), and rephrases the question as “which commandment *in the law* (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ) is the *greatest* (μεγάλῃ)?”⁵⁷⁹ The Matthean version hones the phraseology to make explicit that the question concerns the proper interpretation of the law.⁵⁸⁰ Jesus answers the Pharisee with two commandments. The love of God is ἡ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη ἐντολή (“*The greatest and first commandment*”) but equally important (ὁμοία) is the second

577. J. Andrew Overman, *Matthew’s Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 84. Also, D. A. Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, WBC 33B (Waco, TX: Word, 1995), 644-45.

578. Robert Horton Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 447. Also, Nolland, *Matthew*, 910; Robert Banks, *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition*, SNTSMS 28 (Cambridge: CUP, 1975), 166. Luz, by contrast, thinks that the conversation is not polemical. Luz, *Matthew 21-28*, 75.

579. As Davies and Allison argue, while μεγάλη here without the article could be taken to be a non-superlative adjective (‘great’ rather than ‘greatest’), it is better to assume that the question corresponds to the answer, which is surely in the superlative. Davies and Allison, *Matthew 19-28*, 240.

580. Luz thinks the Matthean version which asks for the “great” rather than the “first” commandment is more “Jewish” than the Markan version. Luz, *Matthew 21-28*, 89.

commandment to love one's neighbour (Lev 19:18), which again faithfully follows the LXX. Matthew is at pains to show the inseparableness of these two commandments. Luz contends that the citation of Lev 19:18 here is important, "[s]ince he does so without being asked."⁵⁸¹ Whereas the Markan Jesus cites Deut 6:4-5, the Matthean Jesus abbreviates his response by omitting the first half of the *Shema* (which is the introductory statement that frames the command to love YHWH; Deut 6:4) and cites Deut 6:5 straightaway. The string of adverbial qualifiers (v.37) in the Matthean version generally follows the Markan pattern, although against both Mark and the LXX Matthew has ἐν rather than ἐκ in all three phrases. Additionally, Matthew drops the last one (i.e., ἰσχύς), probably in order to bring the structure of the *Shema* closer to the three-fold pattern of the LXX.⁵⁸²

The most striking change in the Matthean version of the Double Love Command is the concluding phrase that radicalises Mark's version: ἐν ταύταις ταῖς δυσὶν ἐντολαῖς ὅλος ὁ νόμος κρέμαται καὶ οἱ προφῆται ("On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets"). Κρεμάννυμι ('to hang [on/up]') is found a handful of times in the LXX to render תלה/תלה (i.e., Deut 21:23; 28:66; Josh 10:26; 2 Sam 18:10; Song 4:4; cf. Judith 8:24) and a few times in the NT (i.e., Matt 18:6; Luke 23:39; Acts 5:39; 10:19; 28:4; Gal 3:13). Yet, none of these has the figurative sense found in Matt 22:40.⁵⁸³ Luz proposes that the meaning of this phrase must be construed in conjunction with other evidence

581. Ibid., 83.

582. On this point, see, Paul Foster, "Why Did Matthew Get the Shema Wrong? A Study of Matthew 22:37," *JBL* 122 (2003): 313-21, 331-32; Davies and Allison, *Matthew* 19-28, 240-41.

583. Donaldson and Nolland observe that Matthew's formulation here exhibits remarkable similarity with some rabbinic parallels (which may even imply Matthew's dependence on them; e.g., b. Ber. 63a). Terence L. Donaldson, "The Law That Hangs (Matthew 22:40): Rabbinic Formulation and Matthean Social World," *CBQ* 57 (1995): 689-709; Nolland, *Matthew*, 912; Jay B. Stern, "Jesus' Citation of Dt 6:5 and Lv 19:18 in the Light of Jewish Tradition," *CBQ* 28 (1966): 312-16. Also: Berger, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu*, I:227-32.

in Matthew and that one cannot simply deduce what Matthew meant by this phrase purely based on the wording. Luz argues that while the structure of 5:21-48 shows that the love command “provides the framework for the antitheses,” it is “by no means the case that all other commandments (for example, the prohibition of divorce or swearing) ‘derive’ from the love commandment.”⁵⁸⁴ Similarly, despite the fact that the Golden Rule is “a fundamental guiding principle,” Matthew seems to make no effort to “derive exegetically all ‘particulars’ from this ‘general’ principle nor to measure the particulars against the general.”⁵⁸⁵ Accordingly, Matthew seems to conceive the relationship between the major commandments and the minor commandments as not one of mutual exclusivity but rather of loose and imprecise complementarity. The major ones were to be practiced without nullifying minor ones and the minor ones stood “under, but also alongside, the major commandments.”⁵⁸⁶ In any case, the imagery of scriptures “hanging” on the Double Love Command is meant to capture its primacy in relation to the interpretation of the Law (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ), which is a theme that frames the entire exchange between Jesus and the Pharisee. Thus, unlike Mark where the love of God and neighbour is spoken of as greater than any other commands (with a specific reference to cultic sacrifice), the Matthean version names the Double Love Command as the hermeneutical key through which the Law and the Prophets are to be interpreted.⁵⁸⁷ Nolland points out

584. Luz, *Matthew 21-28*, 85.

585. Ibid.

586. Ibid.

587. However, Davies and Allison think that “the double commandment to love is not a principle form which all of the law’s commands can be deduced, nor does it replace the Torah, nor is it the hermeneutical key to interpreting the law or for determining the validity or importance of different commandments. Rather is it simply the most basic or important demand of the law, a demand which in no way replaces Torah but instead states its true end. Love the Lord your God and love your neighbour: all the rest is commentary. Matthew’s

that Matthew displays a distinct concern for bringing “the Law and the Prophets into closest possible connection since in his understanding it was the prophetic perspective which enabled the Law to be correctly apprehended.”⁵⁸⁸ Konradt also observes that the levitical love command “functions as a summary of the social will of God and thus as a summary of the commandments from the Decalogue, which themselves represent main sentences of the Torah.”⁵⁸⁹ This particular concern for summarising the will of God is already anticipated earlier when Matthew rounds off the main body of the Sermon on the Mount (5:17-7:12) with the citation of the “Golden Rule” in 7:12.⁵⁹⁰ As such, Matt 22:40 “includes the thought of the fulfillment

text, in other words, postulates that the Torah is in harmony with itself: its twin commandments to love God and neighbour are at one with its other commandments; and the suspension of the law and prophets on the commandments to love simply means that all imperatives are to be performed for the sake of God and neighbour.” Davies and Allison, *Matthew 19-28*, 245-46.

588. Nolland, *Matthew*, 913; quoting his own comment at 7:12. Nolland opines, “Matthew is not requiring his readers to label other Jewish views as to what identifies the heart of the Law as wrong; but he does offer Jesus; answer as intrinsically commending itself and perhaps operating at a level of profundity that some of the other answers on offer lacked. Far from being shown up as inadequate by his questioner, Jesus has an answer which illuminates both the primary thrust of the Law and the challenge of Jesus’ own proclamation of the kingdom.” *Ibid.*, 912. On the issue of canon in the Gospels and Pauline letters, see: Lim, *Formation*, 156-77.

589. Konradt, “Love Command,” 274.

590. Along with the linking οὖν (‘then’; 7:12), the addition of οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται (“for this is the law and the prophets”) in 7:12b which creates an inclusio with 5:17, signals that the Golden Rule serves as a summary of the preceding sections. Nolland, *Matthew*, 328-39. Meier argues that the Golden Rule is not strictly speaking a love command. However, although the Golden Rule is certainly not a love command in form, its meaning and function in Matthew are equivalent to the love command. Given that both the Golden Rule (7:12) and the levitical love command (19:19; 22:39-40) occupy a summarising role—whether ethical (i.e., Decalogue) or scriptural (the Law and the Prophets)—they are best read in the light of each other.

Chester lists the following Hellenistic and Jewish parallels of the Golden Rule: Isocrates, *Ad Nicoclem* 49, *Aigineticus* 51; Cassius Dio, 53.34; Seneca, *De beneficiis* 2.1.1; Sir 31.15; *Let. Aris.* 207; Tobit 4:15; 2 Enoch 61:2. Andrew Chester, “The Golden Rule and the Law of Love” (paper presented at New College Biblical Studies Research Seminar, Edinburgh, November 15, 2013).

of the law and the prophets through Jesus. For Matthew the two great commandments are nothing new when compared with Israel's Bible; they are its fulfillment."⁵⁹¹ As in Mark, Matt 22 draws to a close with Jesus' silencing of the crowd, but the phrase "no one dared to ask him any questions" is reserved until v.46 after the passage about the Son of David (cf. Mark 12:35-37; Luke 20:40-44).

To sum up, the Matthean reception of Lev 19:18 in light of its three citations (5:43-48; 19:16-22; 22:34-40) reveals four things. First, the object of neighbourly love is more expansive in Matthew than in Mark, especially when one takes into consideration the command to love one's enemies (5:43-48). Second, the corollary of this widened scope of love is its practical outworking. Matthew connects the outworking of love to extreme generosity as seen in Jesus' critique of the rich young man, which is also married to the idea of perfection. If loving one's neighbour is so foundational and axiomatic to the point where it directs one towards perfection in Matthew, then it comes as no surprise that Lev 19:18 is part of the greatest command.⁵⁹² Third, Matthew displays a propensity for making use of grand summary terms or statements (5:12; 22:40). This exegetical method is certainly not limited to Matthew, but perhaps it is most pronounced in his Gospel. Closely connected to this third point, fourth and perhaps most salient is the heightened focus on the role of the love command with regards to scriptural interpretation. The Matthean reception of the levitical love command

591. Luz, *Matthew* 21-28, 84.

592. Luz opines, "While it is true that the thought is primarily of concrete deeds rather than of cordial feelings, it is even more important that 'love' is an attitude or behavior of the whole person and that it does not exclude feelings. If we take as a whole the many individual Jewish sayings that point in a similar direction—there are others as well—most likely explanation that Jesus makes an extreme absolute of a statement that (along with others) was also present in Judaism." *Ibid.*, 286.

evidences a much stronger connexion to the interpretation of the Law, as the specific wording of the enquirer (the *greatest* commandment *in the Law*) reveals. Unlike Mark, the two-fold love command is not seen merely as the most prominent among many, but *the* hermeneutical key through which all or every commandment ought to be interpreted. In Furnish's words, "[T]here is an emphasis upon the double commandment *itself* and upon its importance as the key to the right interpretation of the whole law" (italics Furnish's).⁵⁹³ In Matthew then, one finds probably the most grandiose statement—far more than in Mark—concerning the levitical love command.

5.4.3 The Lukan love of neighbour

In Luke Lev 19:18 appears only once in 10:27 in a slightly paraphrased form. Nevertheless, the Lukan version exhibits one of the clearest instances of reconfiguration or broadening of the meaning of neighbourly love. The emphasis on loving one's enemies (6:27-35) and the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:29-37) together frame the Double Love Command in a remarkable fashion.⁵⁹⁴ By way of preliminary observation, one should note that unlike the Matthean love of enemies, which is prefaced with a trimmed version of Lev 19:18, the Lukan love of enemies makes no mention of Lev 19:18. Notwithstanding, since both the Matthean and the Lukan versions of

593. Furnish, *The Love Command*, 32-33.

594. See the introductory remark of C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Nisbet, 1936), 11-33. For a history of interpretation of the parables of Jesus and specialised bibliography on the Good Samaritan, see: Warren S. Kissinger, *The Parables of Jesus: A History of Interpretation and Bibliography*, ATLA 4 (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1979), 1-230, 313-22. Also, see: Klyne Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 361-62.

the love of enemies show remarkable formal and notional affinity (probably originating from the same source), the command to love one's enemies must have also played a significant role in Luke's use of Lev 19:18. The following analysis of the parable of the Good Samaritan will demonstrate this point. In this section, I will turn straight into the analysis of the Lukan Double Love Command pericope, but the analysis will be divided into two parts. Because Luke's version is unique in attaching the parable of the Good Samaritan, which has generated much discussion, I will dedicate a separate section (Part II) to study this parable. I will then conclude this section by combining the two sections and highlighting Luke's unique reception of Lev 19:18.

5.4.3.1 Part I: Love as the key to eternal life (Luke 10:25-28)

Καὶ ἰδοὺ νομικός τις ἀνέστη ἐκπειράζων αὐτὸν λέγων· διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν· ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης [τῆς] καρδίας σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου, καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ· ὀρθῶς ἀπεκρίθης· τοῦτο ποίει καὶ ζήσῃ.

Just then a lawyer stood up to test Jesus. "Teacher," he said, "what must I do to inherit eternal life?" He said to him, "What is written in the law? What do you read there?" He answered, "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your strength, and with all your mind; and your neighbor as yourself." And he said to him, "You have given the right answer; do this, and you will live."

Luke's version differs significantly from both the Markan and the Matthean accounts.⁵⁹⁵ The Lukan version of the Double Love Command (10:25-37) is

595. Regarding the issue of source, the majority of scholars hold that Luke redacted a Markan source perhaps with another independent source (Q), which may have been shared with Matthew. The purported, other common sources for Matthew and Luke are, however, notoriously difficult, if not impossible, to identify. Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*

found, unlike Mark and Matthew, towards the beginning of Jesus and the disciples' trip to Jerusalem. Kilgallen makes a good case that this placement is meant to connect this pericope to the earlier episode, which records the Samaritans' rejection of Jesus (9:51-56).⁵⁹⁶ Luke 10:25-37 is immediately preceded by Jesus' rejoicing over the return of the seventy (10:21-24) and followed by the pericope on Mary and Martha (vv.38-42).⁵⁹⁷ Snodgrass

(Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 139; E. Earl Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 159; Gerhard Sellin, "Lukas als Gleichniserzähler: die Erzählung vom barmherzigen Samariter (Luke 10:25-37)," *ZNW* 66 (1975): 20-21. Fitzmyer thinks that Luke had a non-Markan and non-Q source, which he names "L", at his disposal. Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 877-78. Manson articulates a different kind of common sense approach, arguing that two separate historical events lie behind the Markan/Matthean version and the Lukan version: "[T]he consideration which show the independence of the two accounts also suggest that they are accounts of two separate incidents. For the chief connecting link, the conjunction of the great commandments, is precisely the sort of thing that could appear over and over again." Thomas W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus: As Recorded in the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke* (London: SCM Press, 1949), 259-260. This line of thinking is advanced by Jeremias, Marshall, Bovon, and Bock: Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, trans. S. H. Hooke (London: SCM Press, 1963), 203; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978); François Bovon, *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51-19:27*, trans. Donald S. Deer, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), 55; Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, BECNT 3B (Grand Rapids: BakerBooks, 1996), 1020. Carey contends against these "memory" approaches and re-emphasised the presence of redaction: G. Carey, "Moving Things Ahead: A Lukan Redactional Technique and Its Implications for Gospel Origins," *Biblical Interpretation* 21 (2013): 313-19. Tsuji maintains that the three Gospel accounts emerged from a single event, and the original version contained the parable of the Good Samaritan. He argues that Luke and Matthew had both Mark and non-Markan sources (Q?), and whereas Matthew more or less followed the Markan redaction of the event, Luke used the other more historical, non-Markan source. Tsuji, *The Beginning*, 40. Garrow advances what he calls the "Matthean Conflation Hypothesis" (a.k.a., Matthean Posteriority Theory), contending that while Luke employed Mark and the so-called Q, Matthew had all three, viz., Mark, Q and Luke, at his disposal. If the consideration can be limited to the pericopes dealt below, Garrow's theory has the greatest explanatory power. Alan Garrow, "Streeter's 'Other' Synoptic Solution: The Matthew Conflator Hypothesis," (paper presented at New College Biblical Studies Research Seminar, Edinburgh, October 24, 2014).

596. John J. Kilgallen, "The Plan of the 'Nomikos' (Luke 10:25-37)," *NTS* 42 (1996): 615-19.

597. Many scholars (e.g., Bovon) see that the story of Mary and Martha as an amplification of the first commandment on the love of God. The Mary and Martha pericope is to the first commandment, the parable of the Good Samaritan is to the second.

identifies the close connexion between the Good Samaritan and the several surrounding sayings that “emphasize the presence of the kingdom of God” (i.e., sending of the seventy [10:1-16]; return of the seventy and the fall of Satan [10:17-20]; praise of God’s revelation in the Son and the privilege of the disciples in witnessing this [10:21-24]).⁵⁹⁸ The most distinct feature of the Lukan version, of course, is the presence of the parable of the Good Samaritan (vv.29-37), which foregrounds a different dimension in the definition of the neighbour. If the parable portion is excluded, the Lukan version is the shortest of the three (vv.25-28 below). The structure may be divided neatly as follows:

v.25a	Opening
v.25b	The lawyer’s first question
v.26	Jesus’ first response: first question
v.27	The lawyer’s first response: love God and neighbour
v.28	Jesus’ affirmation and exhortation
v.29a	Transition: second opening
v.29b	The lawyer’s second question
vv.30-35	Jesus’ second response: the Good Samaritan
v.36	Jesus’ second question
v.37a	The lawyer’s second response
v.37b	Jesus’ closing exhortation

Luke’s account begins with *καὶ ἰδοὺ*, which signals a new beginning in the narrative, but the vagueness of language prevents one from identifying precisely how much time elapsed since the preceding pericope.⁵⁹⁹ Instead of Mark’s scribe or Matthew’s Pharisee, a certain lawyer (*νομικός τις*) stands up

598. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 344.

599. Bovon, *Luke 2*, 54.

to pose a question to Jesus. Although, like Matthew, Luke situates the dialogue within a framework of conflict and employs the motif of “testing” (ἐκπειράζων; Luke 10:25),⁶⁰⁰ the overall tone of the Lukan account is less hostile than that of Matthew (cf. Mark 12:34; Luke 10:28).⁶⁰¹ The question posed by the lawyer is noticeably different from the ones in Mark or Matthew: διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; (“Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?”)⁶⁰² The addition of the vocative, διδάσκαλε, is shared with the Matthean version. While some may argue that the meaning of the Lukan question corresponds to the Matthean one, such a suggestion is untenable—however closely tied these notions were in Jewish thought. Rather than enquiring about the most important or the greatest commandment in the Law, the Lukan lawyer wants to know how to inherit eternal life. As one might expect from a different question, Jesus’ response is likewise different. He responds to the lawyer not with a direct answer but with two

600. This common theme of “testing” between Matthew and Luke is used to argue for a shared non-Markan source between them.

601. Some, like Kilgallen and Bailey, read this idea of testing in a much more negative and hostile light. Kilgallen, “The Plan”; Kenneth E. Bailey, *Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes: Cultural Studies in the Gospels* (London: SPCK, 2008), 286-87. Esler points out that this exchange between the lawyer and Jesus conforms to the standard “challenge and response” model in the Hellenistic world. Philip Francis Esler, “Jesus and the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict: The Parable of the Good Samaritan in the Light of Social Identity Theory,” *Biblical Interpretation* 8 (2000): 333. Also, see: Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (London: SCM Press, 1983), 34-39. Schottroff reproves the negative reading of this pericope. She locates the exchange between Jesus and the lawyer “within the Jewish culture of discussion” and asserts that interpreting the “testing” of the lawyer in a hostile sense of either laying trap or being self-righteous is a product of an “anti-Jewish reading.” Luise Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, trans. Linda M. Maloney (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 132. See also: Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 353.

602. Bailey contends that the lawyer is not posing a genuine question but wants to challenge Jesus. Bailey makes an interesting observation on this point: “Inheritance, by its very nature, is a gift from one family member (or friend) to another. If you are born into a family, or perhaps adopted into it, then you can inherit. Inheritance is not payment for services rendered. The questioner in this story is a religious lawyer who is fully aware of such things.” Bailey, *Jesus*, 286.

interconnected questions: ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις; (“What is written in the law? What do you read there?”). Then the lawyer readily responds to his own question, citing the Double Love Command. The Lukan citations of Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18, specifically the adverbial phrases attached to the command to love God once again slightly differ from the LXX, Mark and Matthew.⁶⁰³

Deut 6:5 (LXX) [a] ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου, [b] ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου, [c] ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεώς σου

Mark 12:30

[a] ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου

[b] ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου

[d] ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου

[e] ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου

Matt 22:37

[a] ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου

[b] ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου

[d] ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου

Luke 10:27

[a] ἐξ ὅλης [τῆς] καρδίας σου

[b] ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου

[e] ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου

[d] ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου

Whereas the number of adverbial qualifiers in Luke conforms to the Markan version, the ἐν prepositions (excepting the first one) matches the Matthean version. When these are compared to Deut 6:5 (LXX), it becomes apparent that [a] καρδία (‘heart’) and [b] ψυχή (‘soul’) are common in all of these. Mark and Luke have [e] ἰσχυς, which corresponds to [c] δυνάμεώς of Deut 6:5, and all the Synoptic Gospels add [d] διάνοια to the mix. The order of [d] and [e] are reversed in Luke compared with Mark. Although the precise formulations of the adverbial phrases differ, all the writers maintain the common emphasis on the idea that the true love for God requires one’s totality. In Bovon’s words, “[T]he listing of these domains serves more as a way of indicating the

603. On the divergence of the adverbial phrases, see: Marshall, *Luke*, 443; Ruzer, *Mapping*, 75-76. For various Septuagintal witnesses, see: John. W. Wevers, ed., *Deuteronomium*, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum III,2 (Göttingen: V&R, 1977); also, see: Foster, “Why did Matthew,” 319-21.

whole and the global intensity of the commitment than as a way of demarcating the functions of each of them.”⁶⁰⁴

The second command is clearly a quotation of Lev 19:18, but Luke reworks it as a dependent clause (καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν) that is joined onto the first command. Unlike Mark or Matthew in which the two-fold love command is placed first (Mark) or only (Matthew) in the mouth of Jesus, it is actually only from the mouth of the lawyer that the Double Love Command is spoken in Luke. Jesus simply affirms the lawyer’s answer and exhorts him with a pithy phrase: τοῦτο ποίει καὶ ζήσῃ (“Do this, and you will live”).⁶⁰⁵ The deliberate employment of ποιέω in v.25 and v.28 creates an *inclusio*.⁶⁰⁶ While both the Markan and the Matthean versions end with evaluative statements about the Double Love Command itself and, in Mark’s case, Jesus’ assessment of the scribe (Mark 12:34), the focus of the Lukan Jesus is more personal. The focus is on the lawyer, particularly on his performance of this scriptural mandate. The following statement that the lawyer felt compelled to “justify himself” seems to suggest that Jesus’ exhortation was indeed “a closure with a sting,” since it insinuates that the lawyer may not be obeying these commands after all.⁶⁰⁷

5.4.3.2 Part II: Love as supreme compassion (10:29-37)

ὁ δὲ θέλων δικαιῶσαι ἑαυτὸν εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν· καὶ τίς ἐστὶν μου

604. Bovon, *Luke* 2, 55.

605. Sprinkle locates the dependence of this phrase in the Joseph story. Preston Sprinkle, “The Use of Genesis 42:18 (not Leviticus 18:5) in Luke 10:28,” *BBR* 17 (2007), 193–205.

606. This section of the dialogue opens and closes with “do” and “live.” Bailey, *Jesus*, 286.

607. Esler, “Jesus and the Reduction,” 333. Tsuji interprets this response similarly but suggest that Jesus gives the cold shoulder to the lawyer, pointing out the irony of his life and shaming him, which then prompts the lawyer to justify himself. Tsuji, *The Beginning*, 32.

πλησίον; Ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἄνθρωπός τις κατέβαινεν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ εἰς Ἱεριχὼ καὶ λησταῖς περιέπεσεν, οἱ καὶ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτὸν καὶ πληγὰς ἐπιθέντες ἀπῆλθον ἀφέντες ἡμιθανῆ. κατὰ συγκυρίαν δὲ ἱερεὺς τις κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐκείνῃ καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ἀντιπαρῆλθεν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Λευίτης [γενόμενος] κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν ἀντιπαρῆλθεν. Σαμαρίτης δὲ τις ὁδεύων ἦλθεν κατ' αὐτὸν καὶ ἰδὼν ἐσπλαγχνίσθη, καὶ προσελθὼν κατέδυσεν τὰ τραύματα αὐτοῦ ἐπιχέων ἔλαιον καὶ οἶνον, ἐπιβιβάσας δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον κτῆνος ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς πανδοχεῖον καὶ ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν αὖριον ἐκβαλὼν ἔδωκεν δύο δηνάρια τῷ πανδοχεῖ καὶ εἶπεν· ἐπιμελήθητι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅ τι ἂν προσδαπανήσης ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρχεσθαί με ἀποδώσω σοι. τίς τούτων τῶν τριῶν πλησίον δοκεῖ σοι γεγονέναι τοῦ ἐμπεσόντος εἰς τοὺς ληστές; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετ' αὐτοῦ. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· πορεύου καὶ σὺ ποιεῖ ὁμοίως.

But wanting to justify himself, he asked Jesus, "And who is my neighbor?" Jesus replied, "A man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell into the hands of robbers, who stripped him, beat him, and went away, leaving him half dead. Now by chance a priest was going down that road; and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. So likewise a Levite, when he came to the place and saw him, passed by on the other side. But a Samaritan while traveling came near him; and when he saw him, he was moved with pity. He went to him and bandaged his wounds, having poured oil and wine on them. Then he put him on his own animal, brought him to an inn, and took care of him. The next day he took out two denarii, gave them to the innkeeper, and said, 'Take care of him; and when I come back, I will repay you whatever more you spend.' Which of these three, do you think, was a neighbor to the man who fell into the hands of the robbers?" He said, "The one who showed him mercy." Jesus said to him, "Go and do likewise."

V.29 transitions into the parable of the Good Samaritan.⁶⁰⁸ After being exhorted to observe the Double Love Command, the lawyer now feels compelled *δικαιῶσαι ἑαυτὸν* ('to justify himself') and poses another question: καὶ

608. Snodgrass elaborates on various exegetical issues on the parable and catalogues some helpful primary source material. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 338-62. Against the traditional label of "example story," Snodgrass contends, "The parable of the Good Samaritan is, then, a single indirect parable. The label 'example story' is inadequate and inappropriate and should be dropped, no matter how entrenched it is in discussions of parables. The Good Samaritan is not a metaphorical story about some other reality. It is about a compassionate Samaritan and is intended to teach about the love command." Ibid., 352.

τίς ἐστίν μου πλησίον; (“and who is my neighbour?”) Jeremias argues that πρὸς / πλησίον “implies a reciprocal relation” and that neither Jesus nor the scribe is after a legal definition of the neighbour “but the extent of the conception of *rea'*: the only difference between them is that the scribe is looking at the matter from a theoretical point of view, while Jesus illuminates the question with a practical example.”⁶⁰⁹ The precise sense of δικαιῶσαι ἑαυτὸν, which recurs in Luke 16:15 (cf. 7:29; 18:9, 14), is debated, but its construal depends largely on what one makes of the overall tone of the passage. For instance, Jeremias observes that the lawyer had been “disturbed in conscience by Jesus’ preaching.”⁶¹⁰ Nolland thinks that the lawyer wants to “appear in a good light” after he has been embarrassed by Jesus’ response.⁶¹¹ Kilgallen portrays the lawyer as more conniving, arguing that this second question stages the real testing, and the phrase means “that he now can show that he was right to challenge Jesus, that he will now be shown to be justified in putting Jesus to the test.”⁶¹² Whatever the precise meaning of “justify himself,” Kilgallen correctly observes, “[I]n the author's strategy, the test is ... to show that the interpretation of the love of neighbour, as Jesus practiced it, is correct and to be imitated in order to inherit eternal life.”⁶¹³ To the lawyer’s second question, Jesus replies not with a propositional statement but instead with a well-known parable of the Good Samaritan.⁶¹⁴ “A certain man” (ἄνθρωπός τις)⁶¹⁵ is going down from Jerusalem to Jericho in the Jordan

609. Jeremias, *Parables*, 205. Linnemann agrees. Eta Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus: Introduction and Exposition*, trans. John Sturdy (London: SPCK, 1966), 51-53.

610. Jeremias, *Parables*, 202.

611. John Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34*, WBC 35B (Waco, TX: Word, 1993), 592.

612. Kilgallen, “The Plan,” 618.

613. *Ibid.*, 619.

614. The parable does not contain the adjective “good.”

615. The phrase recurs in Luke 12:16; 14:2, 16; 15:11; 16:1, 19; 19:12; 20:9; Acts 9:33.

rift valley, where the former is approximately 2,500 feet above sea level and the latter approximately 800 feet below.⁶¹⁶ According to Josephus (*J.W.* 4.8,3 sec 474), this was about eighteen miles (150 *stadioi*) through the desert and rocky country.⁶¹⁷ The man is assaulted by robbers who strip (ἐκδύσαντες) and beat (πληγὰς ἐπιθέντες) him and then depart (ἀπῆλθον) from the scene, leaving him half-dead (ἡμιθανῆ). Hultgren observes that ἡμιθανῆ could mean either the man “could be taken for dead, that is, that he was unconscious and looked like a corpse” or “he was injured so badly that his life was in peril, and that he needed help to survive.”⁶¹⁸ This is the only occurrence of ἡμιθανῆ in the NT, but Hultgren defends the latter option based on its non-NT usages, which refers to “a person’s being on the point of death” (cf. Diodorus Siculus, *History* 12.62.5; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities* 10.7.4; Strabo, *Geography*, 2.3.4; *Amherst Papyri* 2.141.13). The Samaritan’s compassion, which wells up in him upon seeing the wounded and becomes the impetus for his action, makes more sense if the man appeared alive and was in severe condition as well.⁶¹⁹ Either way, what was the identity of the hapless man? A good deal of ink has been spilt on this question, and several interpretations have been proposed.⁶²⁰ Contrary to the common assumption that this certain man was an Israelite, Esler makes an insightful observation:

616. Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 430.

617. Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 886. Jericho mentioned here is not the Jericho of the HB but the town founded by Herod the Great “about a mile and a half to the south on the western edge of the Jordan plain, where the Wadi Qelt opens on to it (= Tulul Abu el-‘Alayiq).” Ibid. Also, Arland J. Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary*, The Bible in Its World (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 95-96.

618. Hultgren, *Parables*, 96.

619. Ibid.

620. See Sellin’s overview: Sellin, “Lukas als Gleichniserzähler,” 23-29.

Jesus' failure to specify the man's ethnicity is absolutely essential to the situation he establishes and to what transpires thereafter. ...this detail was important for two reasons. First, it meant that an observer had lost the chance to assess the victim's ethnicity by what he was wearing. ...it seems probable that Judean and non-Judean inhabitants of Palestine could be distinguished by their clothing. Secondly, and more importantly, the man's nakedness enabled an observer to determine whether he was circumcised or not. If uncircumcised, he was a Gentile and certainly not a neighbour; if circumcised an Israelite or a Samaritan. At this point, therefore, the lawyer would have imagined that an admittedly formidable case had been posed into which various Israelites could now be introduced to test the meaning of Lev. 19:18.⁶²¹

Knowles also points out the significance of clothing in the parable. He argues that the stripping "depicts humiliation as much as material loss. In fact, the anonymous victim is deprived not only of his possessions but also of his social location, for with his clothing he has lost vital external to kens of his social identity."⁶²² Since Jesus seems to assume that the Samaritans were recognisable by sight, a good case can be made that the Samaritans dressed differently from the Jews or other religious groups in the Greco-Roman world. In any event, the equivocated identity of the man who is now completely stripped of his social location is both deliberate and essential to the parable. This masterly parable only tells the reader precisely enough (but not an inch more) of the characters' identities and their motivation to advance the plot.

In the man's hour of desperation appears "a certain priest" (ἱερεὺς τις) by chance (κατὰ συγκυρίαν). The priest sees (ιδὼν) the wounded, but he simply

621. Esler, "Jesus and the Reduction," 337-38.

622. M. P. Knowles, "What Was the Victim Wearing? Literary, Economic, and Social Contexts for the Parable of the Good Samaritan," *Biblical Interpretation* 12 (2004), 157.

passes by on the other side (ἀντιπαρῆλθεν) of the road. Likewise (ὁμοίως), a certain Levite enters the scene and sees the man in dire need, but he too passes by (ἀντιπαρῆλθεν). Once again, nothing about the priest's or the Levite's motivation is stated but only that they acted in the same manner, which the verbal parallelism signals. However, the narrative's silence on the priest's or the Levite's motivation has not detracted exegetes from trying to triangulate their motivation. Some see their portrayal as stemming from anti-clerical polemic, but most interpreters argue that the priest was afraid of corpse contamination in line with Lev 21:1-4. This view has been advanced by Derrett, Sanders, Bauckham, Fitzmyer and more recently by Kazen.⁶²³ For example, Bauckham thinks that the central question of the parable is, "To precisely what circumstances does the commandment to love one's neighbour apply?"⁶²⁴ He construes the whole parable as a halakhic discourse that is not interested in discussing "a restrictive or a non-restrictive understanding of the neighbour. The question is not which groups are covered by the term neighbour (do Samaritans count?)."⁶²⁵ Instead, he contends that the parable "carefully constructs an unusual case in which obligation to a biblical purity law conflicts with obligation to help someone

623. J. Duncan M. Derrett, "Law in the New Testament: Fresh Light on the Parable of the Good Samaritan," *NTS* 11 (1964): 22-37; Sanders, *Jewish Law*, 41-42; Richard Bauckham, "The Scrupulous Priest and the Good Samaritan," *NTS* 44 (1998), 477; Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 877-78; Thomas Kazen, "The Good Samaritan and a Presumptive Corpse," *SEÅ* 71 (2006): 131-44.

624. Bauckham, "Scrupulous Priest," 476. Bauckham observes that "one forbids the priest to contract impurity by contact with a dead body, while the other requires the priest to show neighbourly love to the wounded man." *Ibid.*, 477. Contra Bauckham, see: Esler, "Jesus and the Reduction," 338-41. Linnemann also argues against the attempt "to find an excuse," which is "out of keeping with the spirit of the story," for the priest and the Levite. Linnemann, *Parables*, 53.

625. Bauckham, "Scrupulous Priest," 488.

in great need.”⁶²⁶ While the crucial importance of purity issues for the priest and the Levite cannot be gainsaid, the exaggerated (and perhaps exclusive for Bauckham) emphasis on the halakhic dimension of the parable is problematic. Jeremias points out that the fear of contamination is unlikely since “the Levite was only required to observe ritual cleanliness in the course of his cultic activities” and both the priest and the Levite were journeying *away* from Jerusalem, which probably indicates the completion of their temple duties.⁶²⁷ He argues that “there would be nothing to prevent him [i.e., the Levite] from touching ‘a dead body by the road’.”⁶²⁸ Moreover, the fact that the priest and the Levites were travelling alone weakens Bauckham’s view, since “the weekly detachments of priests, levites, and laymen who ran the temple service, used to travel up to Jerusalem in closed groups.”⁶²⁹ Green also notes that even the priest had the obligation to bury a neglected corpse.⁶³⁰ Esler observes that provisions were made in Num 19:11-16 to deal with contamination generated by a corpse, which was an admittedly expensive and inconvenient procedure that would have posed a “question of time, inconvenience and expense” for the priest.⁶³¹ Furthermore, in light of the larger literary framework into which the parable is situated, namely, as a response to the lawyer’s question that explicitly seeks the legal definition of

626. Ibid., 479.

627. Jeremias, *Parables*, 203-4.

628. Ibid., 204.

629. Ibid.

630. Green, *Luke*, 430. Snodgrass also opposes Bauckham’s reading in a similar way. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 354-55. However, see Kazen’s rebuttal: Kazen, “The Good Samaritan,” 136-39.

631. Esler, “Jesus and the Reduction,” 340. The audience may very well have regarded “this factor as giving the priest a significant reason not to come to the man’s aid.” Ibid., 340-41. Even Bauckham himself concedes, the purity laws applied to the Levites were less stringent than those applied to the priests, yet this still did not cause the Levite to stop and help the wounded man.

the neighbour, the overarching concern of the parable cannot be reduced to the issue of purity. If only the halakhic problem as Bauckham maintains is in view, then the lawyer's second question, viz., "who is my neighbour," muddles rather than clarifies the main point of this Lukan passage. In addition, if the halakhic concern for ordering the law was the main point of the story, one wonders why Luke included (or had not cut out) the initial exchange between the lawyer and Jesus (vv.25-28). The Good Samaritan parable alone would have surely sufficed for this purpose. As such, the main point (or one of the main points) of the Lukan version of the Double Love Command then must be to explore the question, "who is my neighbour?"⁶³²

In any event, why does the narrative introduce both the priest *and* the Levite? Derrett seems to be correct when he argues, "The threefold encounter has the advantage of the threefold act, fitting the folk-tale and the legal presumption equally well."⁶³³ In addition, the introduction of the Levite serves two more specific purposes: first, to confirm the indifference or the negligence of the first character (i.e., the priest), and second, to act as a transitional foil to highlight the contrast between the first and the third (i.e., the Samaritan) characters. These points are substantiated by the use of *ὁμοίως* and the similarity of language (i.e., verbal and thematic resonance) in these verses. The narrative evokes a sense of suspicion that the priest is being negligent (although this is certainly not the central concern of the parable) in the mind of the reader, and the brief but significant addition of the Levite deepens this sense.

632. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 357.

633. Derrett, "Law in NT," 24.

Then comes another figure—this time a certain Samaritan (Σαμαρίτης τις).⁶³⁴ Conforming to the preceding pattern, no detailed description of the Samaritan is given either, but the introduction of a Samaritan here is incredible.⁶³⁵ Not long ago in Luke 9:51-56, Luke mentioned the Samaritans' rejection of the disciples that Jesus had sent, which reminds the reader of the well-known, thorny relationship between the Judeans and the Samaritans.⁶³⁶ This Samaritan who is the most unlikely candidate to help the wounded from the perspective of the Jewish audience sees the wounded man and, unlike the previous two figures, has compassion (ἐσπλαγχνίσθη) on him. Then the narrative spells out the Samaritan's action: he [i] goes (προσελθών) to the wounded, [ii] pours (ἐπιχέων) olive oil and wine over his wound, [iii]

634. Most scholars think the Samaritan as a merchant. Jeremias, *Parables*, 204-5. Knowles writes, "The most coherent, comprehensive explanation is that the parable depicts a Samaritan oil and wine merchant travelling a regular commercial route, which would account for his cargo, his beast, his access to funds, his apparent destination, and his planned return." He further adduces recent archaeological findings to corroborate this age-old proposal. Knowles, "What Was the Victim," 151-55.

635. Some scholars have located the potential background of this story in 2 Chr 28:15. F. Scott Spencer, "2 Chronicles 28:5-15 and the Parable of the Good Samaritan," *WTJ* 46 (1984), 317-49; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 358. Darrett identifies Hos 6:9 and 1 Kgs 13:11-32 as the source of this pericope. Darrett, "Law in NT," 23-24. Recently, Kalimi also argued for the dependance of the parable on 2 Chr 28, which itself draws from 2 Kgs 6:20-23. Isaac Kalimi, "Robbers on the Road to Jericho: Luke's Story of the Good Samaritan and Its Origins in Kings/Chronicles," *ETL* 85 (2009), 51.

636. On the historical identity of the Samaritans and their thorny relations with the Jews in the first century, see: Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*, trans. F. H. Cave and C. H. Cave, study ed. (London: SCM Press, 1969), 352-58; Linnemann, *Parables*, 54; Esler, "Jesus and the Reduction," 325-57; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 345-47. John 4:9 also points to this sentiment: "Jews, remember, use nothing in common with Samaritans." In light of this, Esler notes, "And nothing could be more surprising than Jesus' brief and forceful reaction: 'He turned and rebuked them' [Luke 9:55]. Here we have a revealing indication of his impatience with extreme forms of group differentiation which will become even clearer in ch. 10." Esler, "Jesus and the Reduction," 332. On the reception of the parable of the Good Samaritan, particular in Antiquity, see: Kyriakos Stavrianos, "The Parable of the Good Samaritan in Patristic Thought," *GOTR* 57 (2012): 29-48.

bandages (κατέδησεν) the wound, [iv] loads (ἐπιβίβασας) him onto the animal, [v] leads (ἤγαγεν) him into an inn (πανδοχεῖον), and [vi] continues to attend to his needs (ἐπεμελήθη).⁶³⁷ On the following day, the Samaritan even offers two denarii to the innkeeper in order to ensure the continued care of the wounded man.⁶³⁸ The Samaritan not only rescues the man in need, but he also goes the extra mile to ensure that he is well looked after. Derrett observes:

Our Samaritan had no hope of enforcing reimbursement. His generosity was exercised while he must have been indifferent to the outcome, whether the Jew would be grateful, would recompense him, or not. The coincidence with what Jesus requires of the initiated Christian at vi. 35 is striking: '[Even sinners lend to sinners in the hope of obtaining thereby reciprocity] but love your "enemies" and do good (to them) and lend (Lev. xxv. 35; Deut. xv. 7-8), abstaining totally from despair, and your reward shall be great.'⁶³⁹

Jesus finishes narrating the parable at v.35, but he has just one more counter-question to pose (v.36): τίς τούτων τῶν τριῶν πλησίον δοκεῖ σοι γεγονέναι τοῦ ἐμπεσόντος εἰς τοὺς ληστές; (*"Which of these three, do you think, was a neighbor to the man who fell into the hands of the robbers?"*). The wording here is significant. Whereas the lawyer enquired about the precise definition of the neighbour (*"who is my neighbour?"*), Jesus' counter-question is *"who became (γεγονέναι) the neighbour?"*⁶⁴⁰ The lawyer speaks for the last time with a correct answer:

637. Knowles, "What Was the Victim," 145-74; Bailey, *Jesus*, 289-97.

638. Presumably, two denarii equaled two days' wages (cf. Matt 20:9-13).

639. Derrett, "Law in NT," 30.

640. Sellin proposes that the scope of a neighbour is limited to the member of the covenant, i.e., the Samaritan, in the parable. Sellin, "Lukas als Gleichniserzähler," 37-60. Nolland undermines Sellin's position. Nolland, *Luke*, II:589-92.

ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετ' αὐτοῦ ('The one who showed compassion on him').⁶⁴¹

Naturally, the last word goes to Jesus, and he ends the exchange with another pithy and powerful exhortation: πορεύου καὶ σὺ ποιεῖ ὁμοίως ('Go and do likewise').⁶⁴² Regarding this final response of Jesus, Manson observes:

It is often made a criticism of the parable of the Good Samaritan that it is no answer to the question posed. But this a shallow criticism. Certainly no definition of 'neighbour' emerges from the parable: and for a very good reason. The question is unanswerable, and ought not to be asked. For love does not begin by defining its objects: it discovers them.⁶⁴³

Nolland suggests that Jesus' answer implicitly assumes that one ought to respond to the question "from a vantage point of isolation and desperate need, and then make use of the same answer when we come at the question from a position of strength, when it is within our gift to be handing out favors, rather than receiving them."⁶⁴⁴ But perhaps Crossan's reflection on

641. Most take this answer as further revealing the lawyer's hostility towards the Samaritan, as he cannot bring himself even to say the word Samaritan. However, one could argue that this shows the lawyer's mental acumen. Perhaps, the lawyer understood the main thrust of the parable, namely, that love expressed as supreme compassion, and his response underscores this point.

642. Some think that Jesus' answer is incoherent here, but this is perfectly in line with Luke's emphasis that "hearing is authenticated in doing (cf. 6:46-49; 8:21)." Green, *Luke*, 426. Tsuji argues that while the lawyer may have genuinely asked for the definition of the neighbour, "Jesus did not respond properly but instead exposed the meaninglessness of arguing over the love of neighbour if one cannot even accept the familiar Samaritans. Jesus was in no way an advocate of the love of neighbour but its critic." Tsuji, *The Beginning*, 159.

643. Manson, *The Sayings*, 261.

644. Nolland, *Luke*, II:597-98. Similarly, Linnemann maintains, "The only thing the Samaritan had in common with the Jews in the eyes of the listeners was that he too was human. If it is he who shows mercy, this mercy is something that man as such shows to man. Any possibility of ascribing it to a common nationality or religion is excluded." Linnemann, *Parables*, 54. Carroll states, "By reframing 'neighbor' as subject rather than object of action, and by telling a story in which the hero who acts in exemplary fashion is a Samaritan, Jesus pushes love of neighbor toward love of enemy." John T. Carroll, *Luke: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: WJKP, 2012), 246.

why it is a Samaritan rather than an ordinary Israelite who comes to the aid of the wounded may be even more sagacious:

If Jesus wanted to teach love of neighbor in distress, it would have sufficed to use the standard folkloric threesome and talk of one person, a second person, and a third person. If he wanted to do this and add in a jibe against the clerical circles of Jerusalem, it would have been quite enough to have mentioned priest, Levite, and let the third person be a Jewish lay-person. Most importantly, if he wanted to inculcate love of one's enemies, it would have been radical enough to have a Jewish person stop and assist a wounded Samaritan. But when the story is read as one told by the Jewish Jesus to a Jewish audience, and presumably in a Jerusalem setting, this original historical context demands that the 'Samaritan' be intended and heard as a socio-religious outcast which he was.... Hence the internal structure of the story and the historical setting of Jesus' time agree that the literal point of the story challenges the hearer to put together two impossible and contradictory words for the same person: 'Samaritan' (10:33) and 'neighbor' (10:36). The whole thrust of the story demands that one say what cannot be said, what is a contradiction in terms: Good + Samaritan.... The point is not that one should help the neighbor in need. In such an intention the naming of the helper as a Samaritan before a Jewish audience would be unnecessary, distracting, and, in the final analysis, inimical and counterproductive. For such a purpose it would have been far better to have made the wounded man a Samaritan and the helper a Jewish man outside clerical circles. But when good (clerics) and bad (Samaritan) become, respectively, bad and good, a world is being challenged and we are faced with polar reversal.⁶⁴⁵

To sum up, the following characterises Luke's particular reception of Lev 19:18. First, the Lukan version of the Double Love Command pericope most fully develops the universal outlook vis-à-vis the definition of the neighbour. While the Matthean scope of the neighbour is much more inclusive

645. John Dominic Crossan, *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), 63-64.

compared to Leviticus or Mark, Luke shows an intense focus on the question of socio-communal boundary. Luke carefully uses the familiar socio-political references in order to draw the reader into the well-crafted world of the parable. But he intentionally clouds the characters' identities and their motivation in order to highlight the following point: the very attempt of defining a legal boundary of neighbourly love is misguided and fundamentally misunderstands the nature of love. While the Markan or the Matthean Jesus probably would engage in the discussion on the definition of the neighbour, the Lukan Jesus turns the question on its head. He obviates the need for the definition by redirecting the discussion to the nature of love itself. This is indeed a remarkable displacement of the emphasis from loving someone "who is like yourself" (בְּמִוֶּדֶד) to loving someone "as yourself" (ὡς σεαυτόν). Second, Luke emphasises the motivational aspect of Lev 19:18. Contra Bauckham, Luke is less interested in the halakhic law *per se* and concentrates on its outworking *as propelled by compassion*. While Matthew is just as concerned about foregrounding the practical outworking of love (i.e., extreme generosity), Luke stresses the inner-disposition out of which love must be translated into action. In this sense, Luke goes beyond both Mark and Matthew. The fact that Jesus' exhortation to the lawyer (v.28, v.37) lacks any specific instruction (e.g., rebuke your fellow, give all your possession away, etc.) also corroborates this point.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter considered the six citations of Lev 19:18 in the NT. Rather than relying on intertextual links and harmonising the meaning of the levitical love command in the light of other citations of Lev 19:18 in the NT,

this chapter has considered how each writer understands and applies the levitical love command in his own writing(s).⁶⁴⁶ Based on the foregoing analysis, a few broad interpretative developments vis-à-vis Lev 19:18 in the NT may be delineated.

First, the Gospel writers establish a singularly close association of the love of God and the love of neighbour. In the Synoptics, the quotation of Lev 19:18 is consistently combined with and placed *after* the quotation of Deut 6:4, that is, the part of the *Shema* that mandates the love of God. Whether the Double Love Command should be understood as creating a hierarchy vis-à-vis the object of love (i.e., God first and then neighbour) or equalising the two parts (i.e., the list enumerates the two aspects of *the* love command without giving any sense of priority to either) is debated.⁶⁴⁷ Nevertheless, it is evident that the love of neighbour is now unambiguously and securely linked with the love of God. Even if the Pentateuch or the prophetic writings implicitly maintained or anticipated the connexion between the love of God and the love of neighbour, these commands were never formulated so succinctly and

646. Ruzer has independently recognised the plurality of Jewish exegetical practices surrounding Lev 19:18 in the Second Temple period. In his attempt to argue for the evolution of Lev 19:18 from the love of neighbour to the love of enemy in the NT, he observes, "One may say that both tendencies—to emphasize basic human solidarity in weakness on the one hand and to speak of God's benevolence toward humanity on the other—feature prominently in early Jewish exegetical thinking with regard to Leviticus 19:18." Ruzer, *Mapping*, 60.

647. Furnish stresses that the ordering is an incidental detail, giving priority to neither of the commands. Also, Gundry, *Matthew*, 449; Davies and Allison, *Matthew 19-28*, 243. By contrast, Meier thinks Mark clearly marks the priority of the love for God over and above the love for neighbour. Meier, *Marginal Jew*, IV:494. Nolland follows Meier: "The 'second' is, thus, second in importance only to the greatest commandment." Nolland, *Matthew*, 912. Likewise Banks: Banks, *Jesus and the Law*, 167-69. Schnackenberg notes, "Love of God, as in Judaism, occupies the highest place but must be evinced and effectuated in love of neighbor. This is the basic characteristic of Jesus' proclamation (cf. Matt. 5:44-48; 18:23-35; 25:31-46; Luke 10:30-37; etc.) and is utterly basic and essential to his moral doctrine." Schnackenburg, *Matthew*, 222.

formulaically to capture the essence of the Torah. If there was any doubt about the association of these two commandments, it dissipates at this point in the history of Jewish interpretation. However, Paul and James do not share this feature with the Gospels, as they do not explicitly associate the love of neighbour with the love of God. While it is possible, if not very likely, that the theological association of the love of God and the love of neighbour undergirds the use of Lev 19:18 for both Paul and James, the fact remains that they only speak of Lev 19:18 as the fulfilment of the law, not Deut 6:5. If the Double Love Command tradition was already well established at this point, it is difficult to see why Paul and James both omit the explicit employment of the Double Love Command tradition from their compositions. Judging from the way in which the association of the love of God and the love of neighbour become so ingrained in the Gospels and later Jewish and Christian writings (e.g., Gen. Rab. 24:7, *Didache*, *T. 12 Patr.*), perhaps it is better to assume that Paul and James did not know the Double Love Command tradition—at least not as it is preserved in the Gospels.

Second, Lev 19:18 functions most explicitly, insofar as it forms the integral and indispensable part of the Double Love Command, as the true and complete summary of the will of God. Lev 19:18 is the foundation upon which the true observance of the Torah is made possible and upon which the practical manifestation of God's will is made visible and accomplished. For Paul, Lev 19:18 captures the essence of the Law. Those who believe in Christ have the power to accomplish the will of God as it was revealed through the Mosaic Law not through perfect observance of individual precepts but through the practice of the love of neighbour. Paul proposes Lev 19:18 as the solution to the problem of (gentile?) Torah fulfilment, as he attempts to

delineate his understanding of God's salvation history. Likewise, James equates Lev 19:18 with the idea of "fulfilling the royal law," but the stress of his exposition lies more on putting the love of neighbour into visible action. While the *fulfilment language* vis-à-vis Lev 19:18 is similar in James and Paul, they do not seem to mean the same thing. For the Synoptics, Mark hails Lev 19:18 as part of the two-fold love command, which is above all other commands (μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολὴ οὐκ ἔστιν; 12:31). What is most distinctive in the Markan version, however, is the ensuing evaluative response of the scribe (Mark 12:32-33) who patently declares the superiority of the Double Love Command over "all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices." Similarly, the Matthean version names the Double Love Command as the hermeneutical key through which all scripture is to be interpreted.

Third, although some of the NT writers evidence a gravitational pull towards a more expansive understanding of the neighbour, that is, the scope of the object of this love is much wider, this cannot be maintained for all of them. While Paul's immediate concern in Romans and Galatians is intra-communal relations, his exposition seems to imply a much wider scope of the neighbour, insofar as his definition of "insiders" and "outsiders" of the church can be read against this universalist backdrop. James uses Lev 19:18 to address a specific issue within the community. While his emphasis is on integrity and putting the love of neighbour into practice, the scope of the neighbour is unclear. As for the Synoptics, when they are read separately, it becomes clear that the idea of the neighbour is not monolithic here either. Whereas Mark is not concerned with redefining the boundary of the neighbour (he does not even command the love of enemy), Matthew and Luke take a leap towards radically broadening this social boundary. In fact,

Matthew's emphasis on the love of enemy can be read in a much more restricted manner but at least Luke's version does away with even the question of "who *is* my neighbour?" Luke paradigmatically displaces the weight placed on this legal question by placing the singular priority on the inner disposition of compassion, which propels one to *become* the neighbour to anyone in need.

Fourth, the NT writers emphasise to varying degrees the practicability of love. In spite of the various ways in which the NT writers innovate or develop the meaning of the levitical love command, there exists a common emphasis on its *practical outworking*. The sheer fact that the love of neighbour continues to be *commanded* assumes that love can and must be seen in action. Much like in the original context of Lev 19:18, love continues to be more than an emotion. Love is a disposition that is expressed outwardly and tangibly. While each writer amplifies this aspect in his own way, Matthew and James most conspicuously link the idea of love to caring for the poor and the needy. The Lukan narrative of the Good Samaritan also reveals the primacy of caring for the one in need as an, if not the, expression of the love of neighbour. Yet again, these writers are also quick to press the point that the act of love must be generated by compassion and mercy.

Chapter Six

Conclusion

6.1 Revisiting the question

This thesis has sought to trace the developing Jewish interpretation of Lev 19:18 *ואהבת לרעך כמוך* during the Second Temple period. Although Lev 19:18 comes to be viewed as the inseparable half of the Double Love Command or the law above all laws by the first century CE, only few instances of its citation, let alone discussion, are found in Jewish literature prior to that point. How could such a central command be discussed rarely in the course of several centuries? Did the hermeneutical prominence of Lev 19:18 suddenly emerge as a radical, interpretative innovation of Jesus or his witnesses in the first century? Do Jewish writings between Leviticus and the Gospels evidence any development of thought? Scholars have already examined Lev 19:18 as well as the broader theme of “love ethic” or the Double Love Command in the NT. However, no study hitherto has traced systematically the reception history of Lev 19:18 from Leviticus up to the Gospels. This study has sought to uncover some interpretative developments in connexion with Lev 19:18 during the Second Temple period. This thesis has aimed to make a meaningful contribution to the field of Biblical Studies by filling this gap of knowledge.

6.2 Summary of the chapters

Following the introductory chapter, Chapter Two examined the meaning of Lev 19:18 in its original context. In order to trace the diachronic development of an idea or changes in the meaning of a command, one must first know what the idea or the command meant in the original context. The love command occurs twice in Lev 19, first at the end of a section that discusses proper intra-Israelite relations (vv.11-18) and second towards the end of the chapter (vv.33-34), which extends the obligation of love to the גר. I have argued that Lev 19:11-18 and 19:33-34 are mainly directed to those who are hierarchically or socially superior in relation to the neighbour (which include the גר) and that love in Leviticus is neither romantic nor wishful. To love is to provide actively for the poor and the needy—and not grudgingly so. The act of love in Leviticus is linked directly to the act of open reproof, which is meant to dispel hidden hatred. Furthermore, despite the popularity of the adverbial rendering of the phrase במדך, I have contended that the context favours the adjectival sense (*‘who is like you’* or *‘the likeness of you’*). The characterisation of the גר as someone who is like an Israelite is not a description of the physical-genealogical reality but an ethical prescription that is meant to shape the way in which the Israelites are to view the גר. The love command is meant to align the attitude of the Israelite with the attitude of YHWH who graciously loves and equitably treats both the native-born and the גר alike. Even though v.18 certainly does act as a minor summary principle in Lev 19, it is still subsumed under the overarching call to be holy (v.2) and functions nothing like the greatest command or the grand hermeneutical principle.

Chapter Three turned to the LXX translation of Lev 19:18 and to Jubilees' use of the love command. I probed LXX-Lev 19:18 in order to see if the translator clarified the ambiguous sense of the levitical love command. If the translator did in fact disambiguate the meaning of the command by assigning explicitly adverbial force to the phrase כְּמוֹד, then the LXX translation would have played a vital role in shaping how this command subsequently came to be read, especially by the NT writers. Contrary to the common assumption, however, the LXX probably did not disambiguate כְּמוֹד as an adverbial phrase, although it did assign an explicitly reflexive sense to it. The analysis of the wider linguistic data from the Greek OT has shown that the ambiguity of the levitical love command remains in the Greek version as well. Consequently, later interpreters who read Lev 19:18 in the Greek version were not simply following the lead of the LXX-Lev translator, but they themselves participated in constructing and crystallising the adverbial sense.

The testamentary portions of Jubilees skilfully interweave Lev 19:17-18 into the composition and assign a very restricted meaning to Lev 19:18. To love the brother in Jubilees is to pursue peaceful co-existence with one's family, and conversely to hate is to separate oneself from the family with the intent to harm—and eventually murder—one's kinsfolk. Only one's family / kinsfolk is designated as the object of love, and the command to love the גֵּר is dropped altogether in Jubilees. While both Leviticus and Jubilees assume the eventual, outward manifestation of hidden hatred, Leviticus does not spell out the potential ways in which hidden hatred externalises itself. Jubilees, by contrast, pinpoints murder as the inevitable consequence of hidden hatred. One feature that stands out in the Jubilean interpretation of

Lev 19:18 is the close association of the practice of brotherly love with the idea of covenant fulfilment and blessing. As it is well-known, Leviticus (and certainly Deuteronomy) links Torah obedience with blessing and disobedience with curse, but nowhere in the HB is the specific command to love one's brother so closely affixed to the idea of covenant fulfilment and concomitant blessing.

Chapter Four considered the citation of Lev 19:18 in CD and its interpretation in S. Even though only CD explicitly cites Lev 19:18, the levitical love command nonetheless plays a central role in S as well. The reception of Lev 19:18 in CD and S is related but clearly not the same. On the one hand, CD 6:20-21 employs Lev 19:18 as a heading within its halakhic exposition of how the Covenanters ought to relate to each other. CD stresses the application of the love command particularly in the social or intra-communal sphere, noting that to love one's brother is to pursue actively and practically his well-being. Furthermore, the love command functions as an anchor onto which the strict observance of specific scriptural demands (CD 7:1-4) are tagged. The Covenanters are to keep them according to the *משפט* and *מצוה* that were specially revealed to those who were brought into the New Covenant. On the other hand, S assigns an even grander role to Lev 19:18, which discloses S's deliberation on this particular scriptural demand. S construes the love of brother as necessarily implying the hatred towards the "non-brother" and systematically incorporates these binary concepts into the composition. S divides the whole world into two categories (the sons of light/darkness, chosen/rejected) and actually applies Lev 19:18 to both of them: those whom God has chosen ought to be loved with the love of neighbour, and conversely those whom God has rejected ought to be hated,

as it were, with the hate of non-neighbour. For S, love and hate are two sides of the same coin, and Lev 19:18 occupies a markedly more central, conceptual space in S. By implication, S universalises the application of Lev 19:18, since it now applies to everyone in the world either positively or negatively. While CD employs Lev 19:18 as a heading and increases its interpretative function, it is S that more thoroughly elevates its role as a prime, guiding principle for the members of the Qumran movement. Despite their interpretative differences, one curious feature is commonly maintained in both CD and S: the increased focus on the role of reproof (Lev 19:17) as a remedy for hidden hatred and as a means of complying to the love command. Both CD and S interpret Lev 19:17 within the framework of intra-communal love and develop open reproof as a mandatory legal procedure. Both texts are at pains to determine the precise details surrounding reproof in order to make it practicable. The care with which the procedural details of Lev 19:17-18 are worked out certainly points to the growing importance of Lev 19:18 in these Qumran texts.

Finally, Chapter Five turned to the reception of Lev 19:18 in the NT and investigated the Pauline (Gal 5:13-14; Rom 13:8-10), the Jamesian (2:1-13), the Markan (12:28-34), the Matthean (5:43-48; 19:16-22; 22:34-40), and the Lukan (10:25-37) interpretations of Lev 19:18. Despite the fact that all these writers cite Lev 19:18 as a crucially significant command, its precise applications and the contextual meanings are much more heterogeneous than often presumed. Even though all the NT writers have “Jesus” in common and engage in Jewish scriptural interpretation, the reception of Lev 19:18 in the NT is far from monolithic.

While both Paul and James analogously link the idea of Torah fulfilment with the practice of Lev 19:18, they do not seem to conceptualise “fulfilment” in the same way. Whereas Paul cites Lev 19:18 in connexion with the role of the Mosaic Law in (gentile) salvation, James cites it as the most important, ethical principle in an attempt to address a specific intra-communal issue (i.e., partiality among those who believe in Christ). Paul is much more interested in locating Lev 19:18 within God’s salvation history as the key proposition. For Paul, it is not meticulous observance of the Torah that forms the basis of salvation but faith in Christ, which works itself out in love (Gal 5:6). By contrast, James is not so much interested in working out the theological rationale for salvation, but rather his aim is to address an exigent and on-the-ground problem in the community. James drives home the claim that one cannot fulfil the royal law, unless one tangibly “does” Lev 19:18—which in the Jamesian context means to put an end to partiality and to act with justice and mercy towards the poor. For Paul then, to “fulfil” is to have faith in Christ, while for James to “fulfil” is to act with justice and mercy. These differences could be construed or harmonised as a matter of difference in emphasis, but there is no reason why one ought to assume that Paul and James maintained the exact same interpretation of Lev 19:18 in their respective socio-theological milieux. If James was consciously composed as an anti-Paul polemic, as Hengel maintains, then this point would be further bolstered.

Even among the Gospel writers, the differences are rather remarkable. The Markan version, which seems to form the basis for the ensuing Matthean and Lukan redactions, names the Double Love Command as the command above all commands—more important than all offerings and sacrifices. That

Lev 19:18 has become the command *par excellence* at this point is clear, but the Markan version lacks two features that are often associated with the Double Love Command tradition: [i] the summarising, hermeneutical role of Lev 19:18 and [ii] the universalisation of the object of love. For all of Mark's effort to elevate the importance of the Double Love Command, he neither makes Lev 19:18 the summary and the hermeneutical principle, as Matthew does, nor attempts to strike out the distinction between the neighbour and the non-neighbour, as Luke does. The fact that Mark makes no mention of the love of enemies in his Gospel is significant in this regard. By contrast, both the Matthean and the Lukan versions venture to universalise the object of the love of neighbour by bonding it with the love of enemies. Matthew ties the love of neighbour to the act of extreme generosity, which in turn is married to the idea of perfection. He also accentuates Lev 19:18 itself as the summary commandment and a key to proper, scriptural interpretation. As for Luke, he is also interested in the practical outworking of the love of neighbour but makes one momentous and virtually unparalleled move: Luke unmistakably universalises the love of neighbour. Through the use of the Good Samaritan parable, Luke illustrates the point that to love one's neighbour as oneself is to *become* the neighbour. To love is to be moved so profoundly by compassion that one aids and provides for anyone in need, regardless of his/her ethnic or religious identity. Love as supreme compassion knows no bounds. It becomes the neighbour to the non-neighbour, the brother (or sister) to the sons (or daughters) of darkness, family to those outside the church, and the ally to the enemies. For the reader who is accustomed to harmonising the NT citations of Lev 19:18, the love command is known simultaneously as the first in importance (Mark), greatest (Matthew), royal (James) command, which is

directed to everyone and anyone (Luke), and a command that is above all offerings and sacrifices (Mark), that fulfils the entire Torah (Paul, James), on which all of Scripture hangs (Matthew), that enables one to inherit eternal life (Luke). But such a grand picture of Lev 19:18 only emerges when these books of the NT are read in their canonical context. The Lukan move away from the legal definition of “being” a neighbour to the volitional feat of “becoming” a neighbour is indeed an astonishing move. It is in Luke alone where Lev 19:18 emerges in its totally positive and universalistic form.

6.3 Tying the knots: the ancient reception of Lev 19:18

The foregoing analysis has illustrated the diverse, Jewish reception of Lev 19:18 during the Second Temple period. The meaning of the love command has been understood differently in various socio-political contexts and time periods. The picture of the Jewish reception history is complex and disavows both a steady and simplistic evolutionary trajectory (i.e., the gradual development from inclusive / particularistic to exclusive / universalistic, covenantal obligation to altruism) and a sudden and total break with preceding interpretative traditions by Jesus or the NT writers. Four major conclusions may now be drawn.

First, the interpretative fluidity of Lev 19:18 was never stabilised among Jewish interpreters in the Second Temple period. The syntactical ambiguity of Lev 19:18 was replete with interpretative potentials and catered to diverse applications, and it remained so at least until the first century CE. The variegated modes of its reception confirms that there was no “mainstream” Jewish, interpretative tradition vis-à-vis Lev 19:18 at this time. This fluidity manifests itself in a few different ways, both continuous and

discontinuous with the original meaning of Lev 19:18. For one, Jewish literature evidences both increasingly inclusive and exclusive attitudes with regards to the object of love. Jubilees exhibits what one might consider to be the most restricted scope of love. This is primarily due to the shape of the narrative, but the lack of openness towards the “non-neighbour” can be hardly denied. In CD a level of openness towards the outsider can be detected, but even so the focus of love is intra-communal. Although CD shows a remarkable openness towards the גר, it is only to the גר that CD takes this open stance. S prizes brotherly love as the supreme calling for the sons of light, but then again the scope is limited to intra-covenantal relations. Even if Paul and James show openness towards outsiders, or the non-Jews, the focus of the command is still limited to the intramural relations among the Jesus-believers, or “those within the church.” Mark makes no overt attempt to redefine the boundary of this love. Only in the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke does the true attempt to transcend the intramural boundaries emerge.

Second and closely related to the first point, is the gradual transformation of the adjectival כַּמּוֹד ('*who is like you*') to the adverbial ὡς σεαυτὸν ('*as yourself*'). This seemingly minor alteration, which displaces the original emphasis on the object of love to the manner by which one loves, is quite weighty. In effect, this move reflects (and further inculcates) the possibility of redefining just who one's neighbour is, or *could be*. Precisely when this change took place or in which strand(s) of Jewish tradition cannot be ascertained from this thesis, but it must be have been sometime after the composition of CD, which still evidences the adjectival sense, and before the first citation of Lev 19:18 in the NT, which evidences the adverbial sense.

Third, most of the texts considered in this thesis emphasise to varying degrees the *practicability* of the love command, especially in the form of succouring the poor and the needy. Lev 19:18 as a command continues to assume an asymmetrical, socio-economic relation between the subject and the object of love in most Jewish texts from the Second Temple period. Despite the fact that Lev 19:18 increasingly becomes a principle, which necessarily involves a degree of abstraction or detachment of the command from its original context, the levitical injunction of love as a *concrete response* to those in need is never lost—whether it be CD’s םא in need, James’ and Matthew’s poor or Luke’s half-dead man on the road.

Finally, the gradual ascendancy of Lev 19:18 in scriptural interpretation is evident during the Second Temple period. Despite its infrequency, every occurrence of Lev 19:18 appears either as a heading or with some form of summarising role. Once again, various groups construed the degree of its interpretative and hermeneutical function differently, but it nevertheless stands that Lev 19:18 consistently comes into view as a command that governs or summarises other commands. Even in the Jubilean narrative, which attributes such a context-specific and restricted meaning to Lev 19:18, the vital significance of Lev 19:18 is verified by two observations: [i] Lev 19:17-18 was systematically interwoven into the narrative and given a prominent place among the commands, and [ii] the practice of Lev 19:18 is tied to covenant blessing.

In the light of the foregoing analysis, it is apparent that Lev 19:18 was not forgotten in Second Temple Judaism only to emerge suddenly as the grand hermeneutical and summarising principle in the first century CE. Rather, a series of complex, if gradual, developments paved the way for Lev

19:18 to attain the status of the command *par excellence* or the greatest command in Jewish scriptural interpretation.

Bibliography

- Achenbach, Reinhard. "gêr - nâkhrî - tôshav - zâr: Legal and Sacral Distinctions regarding Foreigners in the Pentateuch." Pages 29-51 in *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Reinhard Achenbach, Rainer Albertz, and Jakob Wöhrle. BZABR 16. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011.
- Ackerman, Susan. "The Personal Is Political: Covenantal and Affectionate Love ('āhēb, 'ahābâ) in the Hebrew Bible." *VT* 52 (2002): 437–58.
- Adamson, James B. *The Epistle of James*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator." Pages 23-36 in *VII CIOSCS, Leuven, 1989*. Edited by Claude E. Cox. SBLSCS 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Akiyama, Kengo. "The נא and Interpretive Integration in Damascus Document 6:20-21 and 14:3-6." *JJS*. Forthcoming.
- Albeck, Chanoch. *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha*. Berlin: Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, 1930.
- Albertz, Rainer. "From Aliens to Proselytes: Non-Priestly and Priestly Legislation Concerning Strangers." Pages 53-69 in *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Reinhard Achenbach, Rainer Albertz, and Jakob Wöhrle. BZABR 16. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011.
- Alexander, Philip S. "The Redaction-History of Serekh Ha-Yahad: A Proposal." *RevQ* 17 (1996-97): 437–565.
- Alexander, Philip, and Géza Vermes. 1998. *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yahad and Related Texts*. DJD XXVI. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Allbee, Richard A. "Asymmetrical Continuity of Love and Law between the Old and New Testaments: Explicating the Implicit Side of a Hermeneutical Bridge, Leviticus 19.11-18." *JSOT* 31 (2006): 147–66.
- Allison, Dale C., Jr. "Mark 12:28-31 and the Decalogue." In *Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner. JSNTSup 104; SSEJC 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- . *James: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. ICC. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Anderson, Gary A. "The Status of the Torah before Sinai: The Retelling of the Bible in the Damascus Covenant and the Book of Jubilees." *DSD* 1 (1994): 1–29.

- Anthony, David W. *The Horse, the Wheel, and Language: How Bronze-Age Riders from the Eurasian Steppes Shaped the Modern World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Asen, Bernhard A. "From Acceptance to Inclusion: The Stranger (gēr) in Old Testament Tradition." Pages 16-35 in *Christianity and the Stranger: Historical Essays*. Edited by Francis W. Nichols. SBLSCS 12. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Augustine. *Teaching Christianity*, translated by John E. Rotelle and Edmund Hill. Part 1, Vol. 11 of *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*, edited by John E. Rotelle. New York: New City Press, 1996.
- Awabdy, Mark A. *Immigrants and Innovative Law: Deuteronomy's Theological and Social Vision for the גר*. FAT 2/67. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Baden, Joel S. *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*. AYBRL. New Haven: YUP, 2012.
- Baentsch, Bruno. *Das Heiligkeits-Gesetz Lev. XVII-XXVI*. Erfurt: H. Güther, 1893.
- Bailey, Kenneth E. *Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes: Cultural Studies in the Gospels*. London: SPCK, 2008.
- Balentine, Samuel E. *Leviticus*. IBC. Louisville: WJKP, 2002.
- Banks, Robert. *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition*. SNTSMS 28. Cambridge: CUP, 1975.
- Barclay, John M. G. *Obedying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians*. Edited by John Riches. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- Barr, James. *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*. NAWG; MSU 15. Göttingen: V&R, 1979.
- . "Did the Greek Pentateuch Really Serve As A Dictionary For the Translation of the Later Books?" Pages 523-43 in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Martin F. J. Baasten and W. Th. van Peursen. OLA 118. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2003.
- Barton, John. "Law and Narrative in the Pentateuch." *Communio Viatorum* 51 (2009): 126-40.
- . *Ethics in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: OUP, 2014.
- Bartor, Assnat. *Reading Law as Narrative: A Study in the Casuistic Laws of the Pentateuch*. AIL 5. Atlanta: SBL, 2010.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The Scrupulous Priest and the Good Samaritan." *NTS* 44 (1998): 475-89.

- . *James: Wisdom of James, Disciple of Jesus the Sage*. New Testament Readings. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. *Studies in Qumran Law*. SJLA 24. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- . "The Laws of the Damascus Document in Current Research." Pages 51-62 in *Damascus Document Reconsidered*. Edited by Magen Broshi. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992.
- . 1996. *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)*. DJD XVIII. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M., and Daniel R. Schwartz. "Damascus Document (CD)." Pages 4-57 in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. Vol.2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr; Louisville: WJKP, 1995.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M., James H. Charlesworth, Lidija Novakovic, and Henry W. M. Rietz. "Damascus Document 4Q266-273 (4QD^{a-h})." Pages 1-185 in *Damascus Document II, Some Works of the Torah, and Related Documents*. Vol. 3 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Henry W. M. Rietz. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Louisville: WJKP; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Beentjes, Pancratius Cornelis. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*. VTSup 68. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Bencze, Anselm L. "An Analysis of 'Romans XIII. 8-10.'" *NTS* 20 (1973): 90–92.
- Berenbaum, Michael, and Fred Skolnik. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. 22 vols. 2nd ed. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 2007.
- Berger, Klaus. *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu: Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament, Teil I, Markus und Parallelen*. WMANT 40. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972.
- . "Das Buch der Jubiläen." *JSHRZ* 2 (1981): 275–575.
- Bergmeier, Roland. *Die Qumran-Essener-Hypothese: Die Handschriftenfunde bei Khirbet Qumran, ihr spezifischer Trägerkreis und die essenische Gemeinschaftsbewegung*. Biblisch-theologische Studien 133. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Theologie, 2013.
- Berthelot, Katell. "La notion de נגד dans les textes de Qumrân." *RevQ* 19 (1999): 171–216.

- . *L' "Humanité de l'autre homme" dans la pensée juive ancienne*. JSJSup 87. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Bertholet, Alfred. *Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden*. Freiburg: Mohr, 1896.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Blanton, Thomas R. *Constructing a New Covenant: Discursive Strategies in the Damascus Document and Second Corinthians*. WUNT 2/233. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Blum, Erhard. *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*. BZAW 189. Berlin: WdG, 1990.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Luke 9:51-24:53*. BECNT 3B. Grand Rapids: BakerBooks, 1996.
- Bockmuehl, Markus. "Redaction and Ideology in the Rule of the Community (1QS/4QS)." *RevQ* 18 (98 1997): 541–60.
- Boer, Martinus C. de. *Galatians*. NTL. Louisville: WJKP, 2011.
- Bornkamm, Günther. "Das Doppelgebot der Liebe." Pages 85–93 in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann: Zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag am 20. August 1954*. Edited by Walther Eltester. BZNW 21. Berlin: WdG, 1957.
- Bornkamm, Günther, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held. *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium*. WMANT 1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968.
- Botterweck, G. J., H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry, eds. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. 10 vols. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973-2000.
- , eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by John T. Willis et al. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974-2006.
- Bovon, François. *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51-19:27*. Translated by Donald S. Deer. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.
- Boyce, Mark. "The Poetry of the Damascus Document." PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1988.
- . "The Poetry of the Damascus Document and Its Bearing on the Origin of the Qumran Sect." *RevQ* 14 (1990): 615–28.
- Brenton, Sir Lancelot C. L. *The Septuagint in English*. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1851.
- Brock, Sebastian P. "To Revise or Not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation." Pages 301-38 in *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (Manchester, 1990).

- Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars. BJS 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Broshi, Magen, ed. *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1992.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Bultmann, Christoph. *Der Fremde im Antiken Juda: Eine Untersuchung zum sozialen Typenbegriff "ger" und seinem Bedeutungswandel in der alttestamentlichen Gesetzgebung*. FRLANT 153. Göttingen: V&R, 1992.
- Bultmann, Rudolf K. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1963.
- Burchard, Christoph. *Studien zu Theologie, Sprache und Umwelt des Neuen Testaments*. WUNT 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- Burton, Ernest de Witt. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1921.
- Büchner, Dirk L. "Leuitikon." In *NETS*. Oxford: OUP, 2007.
- Callahan, Scott N. *Modality and the Biblical Hebrew Infinitive Absolute*. AKM 71. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010.
- Callaway, Phillip R. *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation*. JSPSup 3. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
- Calvin, John. *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians*. Translated by William Pringle. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1854.
- Campbell, Jonathan G. *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20*. BZAW 228. Berlin: WdG, 1995.
- Carey, Greg. "Moving Things Ahead: A Lukan Redactional Technique and Its Implications for Gospel Origins." *Biblical Interpretation* 21 (2013): 302–19.
- Carmichael, Calum M. "Laws of Leviticus 19." *HTR* 87 (1994): 239–56.
----- *Illuminating Leviticus: A Study of Its Laws and Institutions in the Light of Biblical Narratives*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.
- Carroll, John T. *Luke: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: WJKP, 2012.
- Cazelles, Henri. "La mission d'Esdras." *VT* 4 (1954): 113–40.
- Charles, R. H. *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis: Translated from Editor's Ethiopic Text and Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices*. London: A&C Black, 1902.
- Charlesworth, James H., and Brent A. Strawn. "Reflections on the Text of Serek Ha-Yahad Found in Cave IV." *RevQ* 17 (1996): 403–35.

- Charlesworth, James H., and Elisha Qimron, eds. "Rule of the Community (1QS; Cf. 4QS MSS ^{A-J}, 5Q11)." Pages 1-51 in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr; Louisville: WJKP, 1994.
- Charlesworth, James H., Elisha Qimron, and Frank M. Cross. "Cave IV Fragments." Pages 53-103 in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr; Louisville: WJKP, 1994.
- Chester, Andrew. "The Golden Rule and the Law of Love." Paper presented at New College Biblical Studies Research Seminar, Edinburgh, November 15, 2013.
- Cholewiński, A. *Heiligkeitgesetz und Deuteronomium: Eine vergleichende Studie*. AnBib 66. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
- Clements, Ronald E. *Loving One's Neighbour: Old Testament Ethics in Context: The Ethel M Wood Lecture, 4 March 1992*. London: University of London, 1992.
- Clines, David. "The Ten Commandments, Reading from Left to Right." Pages 97-112 in *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F.A. Sawyer*. Edited by Jon Davies, Graham Harvey, and Wilfred G. E. Watson. JSOTSup 195. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995.
- Cohen, Matty. "Le 'ger' biblique et son statut socio-religieux." *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 207 (1990): 131-58.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. *Why Aren't Jewish Women Circumcised?: Gender and Covenant in Judaism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Collins, John J. "The Yahad and 'The Qumran Community.'" In *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel and Judith Lieu. JSJSup 111. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- ". "Ecclesiasticus, or The Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach." Pages 667-98 in *OBC*. Oxford: OUP, 2007.
- ". *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- ". "Sectarian Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *OHDSS*. Oxford: OUP, 2010.

- . *The "Dead Sea Scrolls": A Biography*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *Commentary on Romans IX-XVI and Essays*. Vol. 2 in *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979.
- Crenshaw, James L. *Education in Ancient Israel: Across the Deadening Silence*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- . *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. Sheffield: Academic Press, 1995.
- Crossan, John Dominic. *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Crüsemann, Frank. *The Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament Law*. Translated by Allan W. Mahnke. New York: Continuum, 1996.
- . "Human Solidarity and Ethnic Identity: Israel's Self-Definition in the Genealogical System of Genesis." Pages 57-76 in *Ethnicity and the Bible*. Edited by Mark G. Brett. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *Mark*. SHBC 20. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2007.
- Das, A. Andrew. *Solving the Romans Debate*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Davenport, Gene L. *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*. StPB-JSJSup 20. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Dauids, Peter H. *The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Davies, G. I. "Introduction to the Pentateuch." Pages 12-38 in *OBC*. Oxford: OUP, 2007.
- Davies, Philip R. *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"*. JSOTSup 25. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.
- . "The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where Is 'Damascus'?" *RevQ* 14 (1990): 503-19.
- . "The 'Damascus' Sect and Judaism." Pages 70-84 in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by John C. Reeves and John Kampen. JSOTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison Jr. *Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII*. Vol. 1 of *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- . *Commentary on Matthew XIX-XXVIII*. Vol. 3 of *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.

- Derrett, J. Duncan M. "Law in the New Testament: Fresh Light on the Parable of the Good Samaritan." *NTS* 11 (1964): 22–37.
- "“Love Thy Neighbor as a Man like Thyself?”" *ExpTim* 83 (1971): 55–56.
- Dibelius, Martin. *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James*. Translated by Michael A. Williams. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Dillmann, August. *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 12. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1897.
- Dines, Jennifer M. *The Septuagint*. Understanding the Bible and Its World. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Parables of the Kingdom*. London: Nisbet, 1936.
- Donaldson, Terence L. "The Law That Hangs (Matthew 22:40): Rabbinic Formulation and Matthean Social World." *CBQ* 57 (1995): 689–709.
- Doran, Robert. "The Non-Dating of Jubilees: Jub 34-38; 23:14-32 in Narrative Context." *JSJ* 20 (1989): 1–11.
- Douglas, Mary. "The Forbidden Animals in Leviticus." *JSOT* 59 (1993): 3–23.
- "Poetic Structure in Leviticus." Page 239-56 in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Edited by David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concept of Pollution and Taboo*. Routledge Classics. London: Routledge & Kegan, 1996.
- *Leviticus as Literature*. Oxford: OUP, 2001.
- Dozeman, Thomas B., Thomas Römer, and Konrad Schmid, eds. *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings*. AIL 8. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- Dozeman, Thomas B., Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz, eds. *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. FAT 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Driver, S. R. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. International Theological Library. 9th ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1913.
- *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. ICC. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902.
- Dunn, James D. G. "The New Perspective on Paul." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 65 (1983): 95–122.
- *Epistle to the Galatians*. BNTC. London: Blackwell, 1993.
- *Romans 9-16*. WBC 38B. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1988.

- . *The New Perspective on Paul: Collected Essays*. WUNT 185. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- . *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Eerdmans, Bernardus Dirk. *Das Buch Leviticus*. Vol. 4 of *Alttestamentliche Studien*. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1912.
- Egmond, W. S. van, and W. H. van Soldt, eds. *Theory and Practice of Knowledge Transfer: Studies in School Education in the Ancient Near East and Beyond: Papers Read at a Symposium in Leiden, 17-19 December 2008*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2012.
- Ehrlich, Arnold B. *Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium*. Vol. 2 of *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel: Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909.
- Elliger, Karl. *Leviticus*. HAT 4. Tübingen: Mohr, 1966.
- Elliot, Mark W. *Engaging Leviticus: Reading Leviticus Theologically with Its Past Interpreters*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2011.
- Elliott, Neil. *The Rhetoric of Romans: Argumentative Constraint and Strategy and Paul's Dialogue with Judaism*. JSNTSup 45. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Ellis, E. Earl. *The Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Endres, John C. *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*. CBQMS 18. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987.
- . "Revisiting the Rebekah of the Book of Jubilees." Pages 765-82 in vol. 2 of *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*. Edited by Erin F. Mason, Kelley Coblentz Bautch, Angela Kim Harkins, and Daniel A. Machiela. JSJSup 153. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Esler, Philip F. *Galatians*. New Testament Readings. London: Routledge, 1998.
- . "Jesus and the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict: The Parable of the Good Samaritan in the Light of Social Identity Theory." *Biblical Interpretation* 8 (2000): 325-57.
- . *Conflict and Identity in Romans*. Biblical Studies. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Evans, Craig A. *Mark 8:27-16:20*. WBC 34B. Waco, TX: Word, 2001.
- Evans, T. V. *Verbal Syntax in The Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference*. Oxford: OUP, 2001.
- Fabry, Heinz-Josef, and Ulrich Dahmen, eds. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011-2013.
- Fassberg, Steven E. "The Linguistic Study of the Damascus Document: A Historical Perspective." Pages 53-67 in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated*

- Literature*, 4-8 February, 1998. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick. STDJ 34. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Fernández Marcos, Natalio. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Biblical Studies and Religious Studies. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Fischer, Irmtraud. "Über 'die Liebe' in hierarchischen Gesellschaftsformen: sozialgeschichtliche Voraussetzungen zum Verständnis von Liebe in der Hebräischen Bibel." Pages 63-81 in *Liebe, Macht und Religion: Interdisziplinäre Studien zu Grunddimensionen menschlicher Existenz: Gedenkschrift für Helmut Merklein*. Edited by Marlis Gielen. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2003.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AYB 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- . *The Gospel according to Luke X-XXIV: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. AYB 28A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Flint, Peter W., and James VanderKam, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998-99.
- Flusser, David. "A New Sensitivity in Judaism and the Christian Message." *HTR* 61 (1968): 107-27.
- Foster, Paul. "Is It Possible to Dispense with Q?" *NT* 45 (2003): 313-37.
- . "Why Did Matthew Get the Shema Wrong? A Study of Matthew 22:37." *JBL* 122 (2003): 309-33.
- . *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew's Gospel*. WUNT 2/177. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Foster, Paul and Andrew F. Gregory, John S. Kloppenborg, and Jozef Verheyden, eds. *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008: Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett*. BETL 239. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- Fredriksen, Paula. "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel." *NTS* 56 (2010): 232-52.
- Freedman, David Noel, ed. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Frick, Peter. "A Syntactical Note on the Dative τῷ κόσμῳ in James 2:5." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 17 (2004): 99-103.
- Fried, Lisbeth S. "From Xeno-Philia to -Phobia: Jewish Encounters with the Other." Pages 179-204 in *Time of Change: Judah and Its Neighbours in the Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods*. Edited by Yigal Levin. LSTS 65; Companion to Qumran Scrolls 8. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

- Friedman, Richard Elliott. "Love Your Neighbor: Only Israelites or Everyone?" *BAR* 40 (2014).
- Fung, Ronald Y. K. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Furfey, Paul Hanly. "PLOUSIOS and Cognates in the New Testament." *CBQ* 5 (1943): 241–63.
- Furnish, Victor Paul. *The Love Command in the New Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.
- Gammie, John G. *Holiness in Israel*. OBT. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2005.
- Garnet, Paul. "Cave 4 MS Parallels to 1QS 5:1-7: Towards a Serek Text History." *JSP* 15 (1997): 67–78.
- Garrow, Allan. "Streeter's 'Other' Synoptic Solution: The Matthew Conflator Hypothesis." Paper presented at New College Biblical Studies Research Seminar, Edinburgh, October 24, 2014.
- Gehman, Henry S. "The Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek." Page 92-101 in *Septuagintal Lexicography for the IOCSCS and SBL Seminar on Lexicography*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft. SCS 1. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1972.
- Gemser, Berend. "The Importance of the Motive Clauses." Pages 50-66 in *Congress Volume: Copenhagen 1953*. Edited by G. W. Anderson, Aage Bentzen, P. A. H. de Boer, Millar Burrows, Henri Cazelles, and Martin Noth. VTSup 1. Leiden: Brill, 1953.
- Gerstenberger, E. S. *Das dritte Buch Mose Leviticus*. ATD 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- . *Leviticus: A Commentary*. OTL. Translated by D. W. Stott. Louisville: WJKP, 1996.
- Gillihan, Yonder M. "The 𐤂𐤓 Who Wasn't There: Fictional Aliens in the Damascus Rule." *RevQ* 98 (2011): 257–306.
- Golb, Norman. "Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls?" *Biblical Archaeologist* 48 (1985): 68–82.
- Goodacre, Mark S. *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and Synoptic Problem*. Biblical Studies. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002.
- Goodman, Lenn E. *Love Thy Neighbour As Thyself*. Oxford: OUP, 2008.
- Goodman, Martin. *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*. Wilde Lectures in Natural and Comparative Religion. Oxford: OUP, 1995.
- . "Religious Variety and the Temple in the Late Second Temple Period and Its Aftermath." *JJS* 60 (2009): 202–13.

- . "Constructing Ancient Judaism from the Scrolls." In *OHDSS*. Oxford: OUP, 2010.
- Gottwald, Norman K. *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 BCE*. BibSem 66. London: SCM Press, 1980.
- . "Religious Conversion and the Societal Origins of Ancient Israel." *PRSt* 15 (1988): 49–65.
- Gowler, David. *James Through the Centuries*. Wiley-Blackwell Bible Commentaries. Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- Görg, Manfred. "Der 'Fremde' (ger): Ein Fremdwort im Alten Testament?." *BN* 25 (1984): 10–13.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Greger, B. "Beobachtungen zum Begriff Ger (ger)." *BN* 63 (1992): 30–34.
- Grelot, P. "La dernière étape de la rédaction sacerdotale." *VT* 6 (1956): 174–89.
- Grundmann, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. THKNT 1. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1972.
- . *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. THKNT 2. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1973.
- Gundry, Robert Horton. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Grünwaldt, Klaus. *Das Heiligkeitgesetz Leviticus 17-26: Ursprüngliche Gestalt, Tradition und Theologie*. BZAW 271. Berlin: WdG, 1999.
- Hagedorn, Anselm C. "Taking the Pentateuch to the Twenty-First Century." *ExpTim* 119 (2007): 53–58.
- Hagner, D. A. *Matthew 14-28*. WBC 33B. Waco, TX: Word, 1995.
- Halpern-Amaru, Betsy. *The Empowerment of Women in the Book of Jubilees*. JSJSup 60. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Haran, Menahem. *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.
- Harlé, Paul, and Didier Pralon. *La Bible d'Alexandrie: le Lévitique: Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et Notes*. Paris: Cerf, 1988.
- Harris, R. Laird, and G. L. Archer Jr., and B. K. Waltke. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Chicago: Moody Publishers, 1980.
- Hartin, Patrick J. *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*. LNTS. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- . *James*. SP 14. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003.
- Hartley, John E. *Leviticus*. WBC 4. Dallas: Word, 1992.

- Hayes, Christine E. *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud*. Oxford: OUP, 2002.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "Who Rebukes in 4Q477?" *RevQ* 6 (1995): 655–56.
- . "Qumran Communities: Beyond the Fringes of Second Temple Society." Pages 43–53 in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans. JSPSup 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- . *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition, and Redaction*. STDJ 29. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . "Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, Disciplinary Procedures." Pages 67–92 in vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . *Damascus Texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- . "Shared Traditions: Points of Contact between S and D." Pages 115–31 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*. Edited by Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller. STDJ 92. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Hengel, Martin. "Der Jakobsbrief als antipaulinische Polemik." Pages 248–78 in *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis for His 60th Birthday*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Otto Betz. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987.
- Herrmann, Wolfram. "Eurneut לרעך כמוך Lev 19, 18αβ." Pages 103–14 in *Von Gott und den Göttern: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*. BZAW 259. Berlin: WdG, 1999.
- Hoffmann, David. *Das Buch Leviticus: Halbband. Lev. XVIII-Ende*. Berlin: M. Poppelauer, 1906.
- Holloway, Paul A. "The Letter of James." Pages 570–81 in *The Blackwell Companion to the New Testament*. Edited by David E. Aune. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Horner, Thomas Marland. "Changing Concepts of the 'Stranger' in the Old Testament." *ATHR* 42 (1960): 49–53.
- Horsley, G. H. R. *Linguistic Essays*. New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity 5. North Ryde, NSW: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1989.
- Hort, F. J. A. *The Epistle of St James*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1909.

- Houten, Christiana van. *The Alien in Israelite Law*. JSOTSup 107. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Hultgren, Arland J. *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary*. The Bible in Its World. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Hultgren, Stephen John. *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 66. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Hurvitz, Avi. *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1982.
- . "The Language of the Priestly Source and Its Historical Setting—The Case for an Early Date." Pages 83-94 in *Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, August 16-21, 1981, Panel Sessions: Bible Studies and Hebrew Language*. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1983.
- . "The Historical Quest for 'Ancient Israel' and the Linguistic Evidence of the Hebrew Bible: Some Methodological Observations." VT 47 (1997): 301–15.
- Hübner, Hans. *Das Gesetz bei Paulus: Ein Beitrag zum Werden der paulinischen Theologie*. FRLANT 119. Göttingen: V&R, 1978.
- Iwry, Samuel. "Was There a Migration to Damascus? The Problem of Shevi Israel." Pages 80-88 of vol. 9 in *In Eretz-Israel: W. F. Albright Volume*. Edited by Abraham Malamat. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1969.
- Jackson, Bernard S. "The Literary Presentation of Multiculturalism in Early Biblical Law." *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law* 8 (1995): 181–206.
- . *Studies in the Semiotics of Biblical Law*. JSOTSup 314. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- . *Wisdom-Laws: A Study of the Mishpatim of Exodus 21:1-22:16*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Jellicoe, Sidney. *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993.
- Jenni, Ernst and Claus Westermann. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. 3 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Jenson, Philip P. *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World*. JSOTSup 106. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*. Translated by S. H. Hooke. London: SCM Press, 1963.

- . *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. Translated by F. H. Cave and C. H. Cave. Study ed. London: SCM Press, 1969.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Luke and the People of God*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.
- Jewett, Robert. *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*. AGJU 10. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- . *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia 59. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. "The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James." *JBL* 101 (1982): 391–401.
- . *The Letter of James: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AYB 37A. New Haven: YUP, 2005.
- Jokiranta, Jutta. "Conceptualising Ger in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 659–77 in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaes*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer, T. M. Law, and Marketta Liljeström. CBET 72. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.
- Jonge, Marinus de. "The Two Great Commandments in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *NT* 44 (2002): 371–92.
- Joosten, Jan. *People and Land in the Holiness Code: An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17–26*. VTSup 67. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Kalimi, Isaac. "Robbers on the Road to Jericho: Luke's Story of the Good Samaritan and Its Origins in Kings/Chronicles." *ETL* 85 (2009): 47–53.
- Kaminsky, Joel S. "Loving One's (Israelite) Neighbor: Election and Commandment in Leviticus 19." *Interpretation* 62 (2008): 123–32.
- Kapfer, Hilary Evans. "The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule: Attitudes Toward the Temple as a Test Case." *DSD* 14 (2007): 152–77.
- Kaufmann, Yehezkel. *The Religion of Israel: From its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile*. Translated by Moshe Greenberg. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1961.
- Kazen, Thomas. "The Good Samaritan and a Presumptive Corpse." *SEA* 71 (2006): 131–44.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *An die Römer*. HNT 8. Tübingen: Mohr, 1974.
- Kennedy, Elisabeth Robertson. *Seeking a Homeland: Sojourn and Ethnic Identity in the Ancestral Narratives of Genesis*. BibInt 106. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

- Kilgallen, John J. "The Plan of the 'Nomikos' (Luke 10:25-37)." *NTS* 42 (1996): 615–19.
- Kilian, Rudolf. *Literarkritische und formgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Heiligkeitgesetzes*. BBB 19. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1963.
- Kirk, Alan. "'Love Your Enemies,' the Golden Rule, and Ancient Reciprocity (Luke 6:27-35)." *JBL* 122 (2003): 667–86.
- Kissinger, Warren S. *The Parables of Jesus: A History of Interpretation and Bibliography*. ATLA 4. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1979.
- Kiuchi, Nobuyoshi. *Leviticus*. ApOTC 3. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2007.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef, Bernard McGinn, Paul Menders-Flohr, Choon-Leong Seow, Hermann Spieckermann, Barry Dov Walfish, and Eric Ziolkowski, eds. *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception*. 30 vols. Berlin: WdG, 2009.
- Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: OUP, 2000.
- Kline, Moshe. "'The Editor Was Nodding': A Reading of Leviticus 19 in Memory of Mary Douglas." *JHebS* 8 (2008): 2-59.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. SAC. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- *Q, the Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus*. Louisville: WJKP, 2008.
- Klostermann, August. *Der Pentateuch: Beiträge zu seinem Verständnis und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte*. Leipzig: Deichert, 1893.
- Knibb, Michael A. *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge Commentary on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World: 200 BC to AD 200. Cambridge: CUP, 1987.
- Knohl, Israel. *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Knowles, Michael P. "What Was the Victim Wearing? Literary, Economic, and Social Contexts for the Parable of the Good Samaritan." *Biblical Interpretation* 12 (2004): 145–74.
- Konradt, Matthias. "The Love Command in Matthew, James and the Didache." Pages 271-88 in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*. Edited by Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg. SymS 45. Atlanta: SBL, 2008.
- Kozar, Joseph Vlcek. "Complementary Insight: A Scribe's Approval of the 'Most Important' Commandment in Mark 12:28-34." *Proceedings - Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* 22 (2002): 35–45.

- Kratz, Reinhard G. "Der Penal Code und das Verhältnis von Serekh Ha-Yachad (S) und Damaskusschrift (D)." *RevQ* 98 (2011): 199–227.
- Krauss, Stuart. "The Word 'Ger' in the Bible and Its Implications." *JBQ* 34 (2006): 264–70.
- Kruse, Collin G. "Community Functionaries in the Rule of the Community and the Damascus Document: A Test of Chronological Relationships." *RevQ* 10 (1981): 543–51.
- Kugel, James L. "On Hidden Hatred and Open Reproach: Early Exegesis of Leviticus 19:17." *HTR* 80 (1987): 43–61.
- . *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- . "The Interpolations in the Book of Jubilees." *RevQ* 24 (2009): 215–72.
- . *A Walk Through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*. JSJSup 156. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Kugler, Robert. *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Guides to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha 10. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Küchler, Siegfried. *Das Heiligkeitgesetz: Lev. 17-26. Eine literar-kritische Untersuchung*. Königsberg: Kümmel, 1929.
- Lambert, David. "Last Testaments in the Book of Jubilees." *DSD* 11 (2004): 82–107.
- Lange, Armin, and Matthias Weigold. *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*. Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 5. Göttingen: V&R, 2011.
- Laws, Sophie. *A Commentary on the Epistle of James*. BNTC. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1980.
- Lee, J. A. L. *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*. SCS 14. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Leenhardt, Franz J. *L'épître de Saint Paul aux Romains*. CNT 6. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1957.
- Levine, Baruch A. *Leviticus: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: JPS, 1989.
- Lévi, Israël. "Un écrit sadducéen antérieur à la destruction du temple." *REJ* 61 (1911): 161–205.
- Lightfoot, Joseph B. *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations*. 10th ed. London: MacMillan, 1865.
- Lim, Timothy H. *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*. AYBRL. New Haven: YUP, 2013.

- Lim, Timothy H., and John J. Collins. "Introduction: Current Issues in the Dead Sea Scrolls Research." In *OHDSS*. Oxford: OUP, 2010.
- Linnemann, Eta. *Parables of Jesus: Introduction and Exposition*. Translated by John Sturdy. London: SPCK, 1966.
- Livneh, Atar. "'Love Your Fellow As Yourself': The Interpretation of Leviticus 19:17-18 in the Book of Jubilees." *DSD* 18 (2011): 173–99.
- Loader, William R. G. *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in the Early Enoch Literature, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Book of Jubilees*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. WBC 41. Waco, TX: Word, 1990.
- Louw, J. P., and Eugene Albert Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Luciani, Didier. *Structure littéraire du Lévitique*. Vol. 1 of *Sainteté et pardon*. BETL 185A. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.
- Luther, Martin. *Lectures on Romans*. Vol. 25 of *Luther's Works*. Edited by Hilton C. Oswald. St. Louis: Concordia, 1972.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by J. E. Crouch. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- . *Matthew 21-28: A Commentary*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by J. E. Crouch. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- . *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by J. E. Crouch. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Lütgert, Wilhelm. *Die Liebe im Neuen Testament: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Urchristentums*. Giessen/Basel: Brunnen, 1986.
- Magonet, Jonathan. "The Structure and Meaning of Leviticus 19." *HAR* 7 (1983): 151–67.
- Malamat, Abraham. "'You Shall Love Your Neighbor as Yourself': A Case of Misinterpretation?." Pages 111-15 in *Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Erhard Blum, Christian Macholz, Ekkehard Stegemann. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990.
- Malina, Bruce J. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. London: SCM Press, 1983.
- Manson, Thomas W. *The Sayings of Jesus: As Recorded in the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke*. London: SCM Press, 1949.
- . *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1962.

- Marcus, Joel. *Mark 8-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AYB 27A. New Haven: YUP, 2009.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Martin, Brice L. *Christ and the Law in Paul*. NovTSup 62. Leiden: Brill, 1989.
- Martin, Ralph P. *James*. WBC 48. Waco, TX: Word, 1988.
- Martyn, James Louis. *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AYB 33A. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Marxsen, Willi. "Der "Ετερος Νόμος Röm. 13,8." TZ 11 (1955): 230–37.
- Mathys, Hans-Peter. *Liebe deinen Nächsten wie dich selbst: Untersuchungen zum alttestamentlichen Gebot der Nächstenliebe (Lev 19, 18)*. OBO 71. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 1986.
- McCartney, Dan G. *James*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.
- McKnight, Scot. *The Letter of James*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Meek, Theophile James. "The Translation of GÊR in the Hexateuch and Its Bearing on the Documentary Hypothesis." JBL 49 (1930): 172–80.
- Meier, John P. *Law and Love*. Vo. 4 of *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. AYBRL. New Haven: YUP, 2009.
- Mendenhall, George E. "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine." BA 25 (1962): 66–87.
- Mermelstein, Ari. "Love and Hate at Qumran: The Social Construction of Sectarian Emotion." DSD 20 (2013): 237–63.
- Metso, Sarianna. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. STDJ 21. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . *The Serekh Texts*. LSTS 62; Companion to Qumran Scrolls 89. London: T&T Clark International, 2007.
- Milgrom, Jacob. "Religious Conversion and the Revolt Model for the Formation of Israel." JBL 101 (1982): 169–76.
- . *Numbers: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. JPS Torah Commentary. New York: JPS, 1990.
- . *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AYB 3. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- . *Leviticus 17-22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AYB 3A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- . *Leviticus 23-27: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AYB 3B. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- . *Leviticus: A Book of Ritual and Ethics*. CC. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.

- Milik, J. T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*. Translated by John Strugnell. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Moffatt, James. *Love in the New Testament*. New York: Richard R Smith, 1930.
- Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2012.
- Montefiore, Hugh. "Thou Shalt Love the Neighbour as Thyself." *NT* 5 (1962): 157–70.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- . *The Letter of James*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Moran, William L. "Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy." *CBQ* 25 (1963): 77–87.
- Morgenstern, Julian. "The Decalogue of the Holiness Code." *HUCA* 26 (1955): 1–27.
- Moule, C. F. D. "Fulfilment-Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse." *NTS* 14 (1968): 293–320.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. "A Syntactic Problem in Lev. XIX.18b." *JSS* 23 (1978): 291–97.
- . *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985.
- . "Translation Techniques and Beyond." Pages 13–22 in *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999*. Edited by Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: V&R, 2001.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "Translation of Damascus Document VI, 11–14." *RevQ* 7 (1971): 553–56.
- . "Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI, 2–VIII, 3." *RB* 78 (1971): 210–32.
- . "Critique of the Princes of Judah: CD 8:3–19." *RB* 79 (1972): 200–16.
- Mußner, Franz. *Der Jakobusbrief: Auslegung*. HThKNT 13, Part 1. Freiburg: Herder, 1987.
- Myllykoski, Matti. "James the Just in History and Tradition: Perspectives of Past and Present Scholarship (Part I)." *CurBR* 5 (2006): 73–122.
- Nebe, Wilhelm G. "Nocheinmal zu Text und Übersetzung von CD VI, 11–14." *RevQ* 16 (1993): 285–87.

- Neudecker, Reinhard. "'And You Shall Love Your Neighbor as Yourself—I Am the Lord' (Lev 19:18) in Jewish Interpretation." *Biblica* 73 (1992): 496–517.
- Newsom, Carol A. "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran." Pages 167–87 in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*. Edited by William H. Propp, Baruch Halpern, and David Noel Freedman. BJSUCS 1. Warsaw, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- . *The Self As Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. STDJ 52. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Nicholson, Ernest. *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.
- Niehoff, Maren R. "The Implied Audience of the Letter of James." Page 57–77 in *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity*. Edited by Gary Anderson, Ruth Clements, David Satran. STDJ 106. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Nihan, Christophe. *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*. FAT 2/25. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- . "Resident Aliens and Natives in the Holiness Legislation." Pages 111–34 in *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Reinhard Achenbach, Rainer Albertz, and Jakob Wöhrle. BZABR 16. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011.
- Nitzan, Billah. "The Laws of Reproof in 4QBerakhot (4Q286–290) in Light of Their Parallels in the Damascus Covenant and Other Texts from Qumran." In *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*. Edited by Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Nolland, John. *Luke 9:21–18:34*. WBC 35B. Waco, TX: Word, 1993.
- . *The Gospel of Matthew*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Noth, Martin. *Das Dritte Buch Mose, Leviticus*. ATD 6. Göttingen: V&R, 1963.
- . *Leviticus*. Translated by J. E. Anderson. OTL. London: SCM Press, 1965.
- Overman, J. Andrew. *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Patrick, Dale. *Old Testament Law*. Atlanta: JKP, 1985.
- Pietersma, Albert. "Psalms." In *NETS*. Oxford: OUP, 2007.

- Piper, John. *"Love Your Enemies": Jesus' Love Command in the Synoptic Gospels and in the Early Christian Paraenesis*. Cambridge: CUP, 1979.
- Porter, J. R. *Leviticus: Commentary*. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: CUP, 1976.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol. 1. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-zvi Press, 2010. [Hebrew]
- Rabin, Chaim. *The Zadokite Documents: I. The Admonition. II. The Laws*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.
- Rabinowitz, Isaac. "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments." *JBL* 73 (1954): 11–35.
- Radday, Yehuda T. "Chiasmus in Hebrew Biblical Narrative." Pages 50–117 in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*. Edited by John W. Welch. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1981.
- Radner, Ephraim. *Leviticus*. SCM Theological Commentary on the Bible. London: SCM Press, 2008.
- Rainey, Anson. Review of *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel 1250-1050 BCE*, by N. K. Gottwald. *JAOS* 107 (1987): 541–43.
- Ramírez Kidd, José E. *Alterity and Identity in Israel: The גר in the Old Testament*. BZAW 283. Berlin: WdG, 1999.
- Räsänen, Heikki. *Paul and the Law*. WUNT 29. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- Regev, Eyal. "Comparing Sectarian Practice and Organization: The Qumran Sects in Light of the Regulations of the Shakers, Hutterites, Mennonites and Amish." *Numen* 51 (2004): 146–81.
- . "Cherchez les femmes: Were the Yaḥad Celibate?" *DSD* 15 (2008): 253–84.
- . "Between Two Sects: Differentiating the Yaḥad and the Damascus Covenant." Pages 431–49 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel. STDJ 90. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. "The Gēr in the Priestly Laws of the Pentateuch." Pages 77–87 in *Ethnicity and the Bible*. Edited by Mark G. Brett. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . *Leviticus*. BKAT 3. Neukirchner-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004.
- Rendtorff, Rolf, and Robert A Kugler, eds. *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*. VTSup 93. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Repschinski, Boris. *The Controversy Stories in the Gospel of Matthew: Their Redaction, Form Und [sic] Relevance for the Relationship between the Matthean Community and Formative Judaism*. FRLANT 189. Göttingen: V&R, 2000.

- Reventlow, Henning. *Das Heiligkeitgesetz: Formgeschichtlich untersucht*. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961.
- Riesner, Rainer. "James." Pages 1255-63 in *OBC*. Oxford: OUP, 2007.
- Ringgren, Helmer. *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Translated by Emilie T. Sander. New York: Crossroad, 1995.
- Ropes, James H. *The Epistle of St James*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1916.
- Ruwe, Andreas. "Heiligkeitgesetz" und "Priesterschrift": Literaturgeschichtliche und rechtssystematische Untersuchungen zu Leviticus 17,1-26,2. FAT 26. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Ruzer, Serge. "From 'Love Your Neighbor' to 'Love Your Enemy': Trajectories in Early Jewish Exegesis." *RB* 109 (2002): 371-89.
- . "The Double Love Precept in the New Testament and the Community Rule." Pages 81-106 in *Jesus' Last Week*. Edited by R. Steven Notley, Marc Turnage, and Brian Becker. Jerusalem Studies in the Synoptic Gospels 1; Jewish and Christian Perspectives 11. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . *Mapping the New Testament: Early Christian Writings as a Witness for Jewish Biblical Exegesis*. Jewish and Christian Perspectives 13. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . "James on Faith and Righteousness in the Context of a Broader Jewish Exegetical Discourse." Page 79-104 in *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity*. Edited by Gary Anderson, Ruth Clements, David Satran. STDJ 106. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Sanders, E. P. "Overlaps of Mark and Q and the Synoptic Problem." *NTS* 19 (1973): 453-65.
- . *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- . *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- . *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies*. London: SCM Press, 1990.
- Santurri, Edmund N., and William Werpehowski, eds. *The Love Commandments: Essays in Christian Ethics and Moral Philosophy*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1992.
- Sawyer, John F. A., ed. *The Blackwell Companion to the Bible and Culture*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
- . *The Fifth Gospel: Isaiah in the History of Christianity*. Cambridge: CUP, 1996.

- Schechter, Solomon. *Documents of Jewish Sectaries: Edited from Hebrew Mss. in the Cairo Genizah Collection Now in the Possession of the University Library, Cambridge*. 2 vols. Cambridge: CUP, 1910.
- Schenker, Adrian. "Das Gebot der Nächstenliebe in seinem Kontext (Lev 19,17–18): lieben ohne Falschheit." *ZAW* 124 (2012): 244–48.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *The Halakhah at Qumran*. SJLA 16. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- . *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony, and the Penal Code*. BJS 33. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.
- . *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran*. Philadelphia: JPS, 1994.
- . *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*. STDJ 75. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H., Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20 - 25, 1997*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Translated by Robert R. Barr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Schofield, Alison. *From Qumran to the Yāḥad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule*. STDJ 77. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Schottroff, Luise. *Essays on the Love Commandment*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.
- . *The Parables of Jesus*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. "The Abolition and Fulfillment of the Law in Paul." *JSNT* (1989): 47–74.
- Schwartz, Baruch J., David P. Wright, Jeffrey Stackert, and Naphtali S. Meshel, eds. *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible*. LHBOTS 474. London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Schwarz, Ottilie J. R. *Der erste Teil der Damaskusschrift und das Alte Testament*. Diest: Lichtland, 1965.
- Schüle, Andreas. "'Denn er ist wie Du': Zu Übersetzung und Verständnis des alttestamentlichen Liebesgebots Lev 19, 18." *ZAW* 113 (2001): 515–34.
- Segal, Michael. *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*. JSJSup 117. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Sellin, Gerhard. "Lukas als Gleichniserzähler: die Erzählung vom barmherzigen Samariter (Luke 10:25-37)." *ZNW* 66 (1975): 166-189.

- Shea, W. H. "Literary Form and Theological Function in Leviticus." Pages 75-118 in vol. 3 of *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*. Edited by Frank B. Holbrook. Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.
- Shemesh, Aharon. "Scriptural Interpretations in the Damascus Document and Their Parallels in Rabbinic Midrash." Pages 161-75 in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998*. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick. STDJ 34. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Slingerland, H. Dixon. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Smith, Christopher R. "The Literary Structure of Leviticus." *JSOT* (1996): 17-32.
- Smith, Morton. *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament*. London: SCM Press, 1987.
- Smith-Christopher, Daniel L. "Between Ezra and Isaiah: Exclusion, Transformation, and Inclusion of the 'Foreigner' in Post-Exilic Biblical Theology." Pages 117-42 in *Ethnicity and the Bible*. Edited by Mark G. Brett. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Snodgrass, Klyne. *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Sollamo, Raija. "Introduction." Pages 7-12 in *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999*. Edited by Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: V&R, 2001.
- Spencer, F. Scott. "2 Chronicles 28:5-15 and the Parable of the Good Samaritan." *WTJ* 46 (1984): 317-49.
- Spicq, Ceslas. *Agapè dans le nouveau testament: analyses des textes*. Études Bibliques. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1958. (Reprinted in English: Spicq, Ceslas. *Agape in the New Testament*. Translated by Marie Aquinas McNamara and Mary Honoria Richter. St. Louis: B. Herder Book, 1965.)
- Spina, F. A. "Israelites as Gerim: Sojourners in Social and Historical Context." Pages 321-35 in *Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday*. Edited by Carol L. Meyers and Michale P. O'Connor. ASOR: Special Volume Series 1. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983.

- Sprinkle, Preston. "The Use of Genesis 42:18 (not Leviticus 18:5) in Luke 10:28." *BBR* 17 (2007): 193–205.
- Stanton, G. N. "Galatians." Pages 1152–65 in *OBC*. Oxford: OUP, 2007.
- Stavrianos, Kyriakos. "The Parable of the Good Samaritan in Patristic Thought." *GOTR* 57 (2012): 29–48.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. "Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde." PhD diss., University of Bonn, 1971.
- , "Towards Physical Reconstructions of the Qumran Damascus Document Scrolls." Pages 177–200 in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4–8 February, 1998*. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick. *STDJ* 34. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Stendahl, Krister. "Hate, Non-Retaliatio, and Love: 1QS X,17–20 and Rom. 12:19–21." *HTR* 55 (1962): 343–55.
- Sterling, Gregory E. "Was There a Common Ethic in Second Temple Judaism?" Pages 171–94 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001*. Edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth Clements. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Stern, Jay B. "Jesus' Citation of Dt 6:5 and Lv 19:18 in the Light of Jewish Tradition." *CBQ* 28 (1966): 312–16.
- Steudel, Annette. "The Damascus Document (D) as Rewriting of the Community Rule (S)." *RevQ* 100 (2012): 605–20.
- Stowers, Stanley K. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews and Gentiles*. New Haven: YUP, 1994.
- Stroup, Christopher. "A Reexamination of the 'Sons of the Pit' in CD 13:14." *DSD* 18 (2011): 45–53.
- Sun, Henry T. C. "An Investigation into the Compositional Integrity of the So-Called Holiness Code (Leviticus 17–26)." PhD diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1990.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Edited by H. St J. Thackeray and Richard Rusden Ottley. Cambridge: CUP, 1914.
- Takeuchi, Yu. "Redonner sens au précepte de 'l'amour du prochain' (Lev19,18ab) — 'comme toi-même bien-aimé' —." *AJBI* 27 (2001), 3–21.
- Tannehill, Robert C. "Varieties of Synoptic Pronouncement Stories." *Semeia* 20 (1981): 101–19.

- Taylor, Joan E. "The Classical Sources on the Essenes and the Scrolls Communities." In *OHDSS*, 173–99. Oxford: OUP, 2010.
- . *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea*. Oxford: OUP, 2012.
- Theißen, Gerd. "Nächstenliebe und Egalität: Jak 2,1–13 als Höhepunkt urchristlicher Ethik." Page 120–42 in *Der Jakobusbrief: Beiträge zur Rehabilitierung der "strohernen Epistel."* Edited by Petra von Gemünden, Matthias Konradt, and Gerd Theissen. Beiträge zum Verstehen der Bibel 3. Münster: Lit, 2003.
- Thiessen, Matthew. *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity*. Oxford: OUP, 2011.
- . "Revisiting the προσήλυτος in 'the LXX.'" *JBL* 132 (2013): 333–50.
- Thomson, Charles. *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Covenant, Commonly Called the Old and New Testament: Translated from the Greek*. Philadelphia: Jane Aitken, 1808.
- Tomson, Peter J. *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles*. CRINT Section III: Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature 1. Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1990.
- Tov, Emanuel. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. JBS 8. Jerusalem: Simor, 1997.
- Tsuji, Manabu. *Glaube zwischen Vollkommenheit und Verweltlichung: Eine Untersuchung zur literarischen Gestalt und zur inhaltlichen Kohärenz des Jakobusbriefes*. WUNT 2/93. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- . "Zwischen Ideal und Realität: Zu den Witwen in 1 Tim 5.3–16." *NTS* 47 (2001): 92–104.
- . "Beyond the Original Context: Reception of the Pauline Letters in the First Century." Pages 5–21 in *Patrologia Pacifica Secunda: Selected Papers Presented to the Asia-Pacific Early Christian Studies Society Fifth Annual Conference (Sendai, Japan, September 10–12, 2009) and Other Patristic Studies*. Edited by Vladimir Baranov, Kazuhiko Demura, and Basil Lourié. Scrinium: Revue de patrologie, d'hagiographie critique et d'histoire ecclésiastique 6. Axioma: Gorgias Press, 2010.
- . "Persönliche Korrespondenz des Paulus: Zur Strategie der Pastoralbriefe als Pseudepigrapha." *NTS* 56 (2010): 253–72.
- . "II Tim 1:6: Laying on of Hands by Paul for Ordination?" *AJBI* 39 (2013).
- . *The Beginning of the Love of Neighbour: A Biblical-critical Investigation*. Tokyo: Shinkyō Publishing, 2010. (辻学「隣人愛のはじまり—聖書学的考察」、新教出版社、2010年6月。)

- Tuckett, Christopher. *From the Sayings to the Gospels*. WUNT 328. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Ullendorff, Edward. "Thought Categories in the Hebrew Bible." Pages 273–88 in *Studies in Rationalism, Judaism and Universalism*. Edited by R. Loewe. London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1966.
- VanderKam, James C. *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. HSM 14. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press for Harvard Semitic Museum, 1977.
- , "The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees." *JSS* 26 (1981): 209–17.
- , ed. *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*. CSCO 510; Scriptores Aethiopici 87. Louvain: Peeters, 1989.
- , ed. *The Book of Jubilees: A Translation*. CSCO 511; Scriptores Aethiopici 88. Louvain: Peeters, 1989.
- , *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- , *Book of Jubilees*. Guides to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- , "The Scriptural Setting of the Book of Jubilees." *DSD* 13 (2006): 61–72.
- , "Recent Scholarship on the Book of Jubilees." *CurBR* 6 (2008): 405–31.
- VanGemenen, Willem A., ed. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 5 vols. Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1997.
- Vaux, Roland de. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Translated by John McHugh. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961.
- Vermes, Geza. "Preliminary Remarks on Unpublished Fragments of the Community Rule from Qumran Cave 4." *JJS* 42 (1991): 250–55.
- , *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: SCM Press, 1999.
- Vermes, Geza, and Martin Goodman, eds. *The Essenes according to the Classical Sources*. JSOT 1. Sheffield: Academic Press, 1989.
- Vink, J. G. *The Date and Origin of the Priestly Code in the Old Testament*. OtSt 15. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- Wachob, Wesley Hiram. *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James*. SNTSMS 106. Cambridge: CUP, 2000.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. *The New Damascus Document: The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary*. STDJ 56. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and Michael Patrick O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

- Ward, Roy Bowen. "Partiality in the Assembly: James 2:2-4." *HTR* 62 (1969): 87–97.
- Warnach, Viktor. *Agape: Die Liebe als Grundmotiv der neutestamentlichen Theologie*. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1951.
- Warning, Wilfried. *Literary Artistry in Leviticus*. *BibInt* 35. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Wasserstein, Abraham, and David Wasserstein. *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today*. Cambridge: CUP, 2006.
- Watson, Francis. *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.
- Weinfeld, Moše. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: OUP, 1972.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. Translated by J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black, 1885.
- Wells, Bruce. "The Quasi-Alien in Leviticus 25." Pages 135–55 in *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Reinhard Achenbach, Rainer Albertz, and Jakob Wöhrle. *BZABR* 16. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *Book of Leviticus*. *NICOT*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Westerholm, Stephen. "On Fulfilling the Whole Law (Gal 5:14)." *SEÅ* 51 (1986): 229–37.
- Wevers, John William, ed. *Deuteronomium*. *Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum* III,2. Göttingen: V&R, 1977.
- , ed. *Leviticus*. *Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum* II,2. Göttingen: V&R, 1986.
- , ed. *LXX: Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*. *SCS* 44. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Wiesenberg, Ernest. "The Jubilees of Jubilees." *RevQ* 3 (1961): 3–40.
- Wise, Michael O. "The Origins and History of the Teacher's Movement." Pages 92–122 in *OHDSS*. Oxford: OUP, 2010.
- Woude, Adam S. van der. "Fifty Years of Qumran Research." Pages 1–45 in vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Wright, Benjamin G. "Sirach." In *NETS*. Oxford: OUP, 2007.
- Wright, N. T. *Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. London: T&T Clark, 1993.
- , ed. *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

- . "The Letter to the Romans." In *The New Interpreter's Bible*, 10:393–770. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002.
- . *Paul: In Fresh Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- Xeravits, Géza G., ed. *Dualism in Qumran*. LSTS 76. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Zetterholm, Magnus. *Approaches to Paul: A Student's Guide to Recent Scholarship*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.